

IPRS-TAC-86-049

23 JUNE 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-049

23 JUNE 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT
ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: Japanese Role in SDI Violates Treaty (D. Belskiy; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 21 May 86)	1
---	---

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Moscow Hits Bonn's Rejection of Gorbachev 15 January Proposal (Ye. Bovkun; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 6 Feb 86)	3
---	---

SALT/START ISSUES

Soviet Comments Assail Reagan SALT II Decision (Various sources, various dates)	6
'Alarm' in U.S., Europe	6
Weinberger: Limits 'Undesirable'	7
Warnke Criticizes Decision	7
U.S. Submarine Launchings, by Vitaliy Ilyashenko	8
Bovin on U.S. Tridents, by Aleksandr Bovin	8
PRAVDA Cites XINHUA, AP	9
Gromyko Terms Decision 'Gaffe'	10
Bovin Scores U.S. Stance, by A. Bovin	10
Zholkver Marks U.S. Attitude, by Aleksandr Zholkver	14
Pasko Hits Reagan Decision, by Vladimir Pasko	15
U.S. Charges Refuted, by A. Mozgovoy	16
Korionov Raps U.S. 'Hawks', by Vitaliy Korionov	17
Kornilov Sees Danger, by Yuriy Kornilov	17
Ambassador to UK Comments, by Tom McMullan	19
Views Violations	20
Discussion at UN Tbilisi Conference, by Yuriy Zhukov	20

West European Opposition, by Yuriy Ulyanov Administration 'Propaganda'	23 24
XINHUA Reports U.S.-Soviet Relations Strained by SALT II Feud (Shi Liyia; Beijing XINHUA, 4 Jun 86)	26
Canada: NATO Foreign Ministers Discuss SALT II Issue (Ottawa THE CITIZEN, 29, 30 May 86)	28
Lord Carrington, Clark Remarks, by Jim Robb First Day Sessions, by Val Sears	28 29
NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS	
Soviet Official Asserts Verification No Longer Problem (L. Semeyko; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 30 May 86)	31
PRAVDA Correspondent on U.S. Motives for Opposing Moratorium (V. Gan; Moscow PRAVDA, 30 May 86)	34
Indian Prime Minister Praises Nuclear Moratorium Extension (Vladimir Baidashin; Moscow TASS, 19 May 86)	37
USSR: U.S. Defies Public Opinion on Test Ban (Moscow PRAVDA, 21, 31 May 86; Moscow Television Service, 23 May 86)	38
'Shameless Lies', by Yuriy Kornilov	38
'Deaf to World Opinion'	39
Protest in Nevada, by Vassiliy Kharkov	40
Senator Urges U.S. Test Ban at North Atlantic Assembly (Albert Balebanov; Moscow TASS, 26 May 86)	42
Moscow Broadcast: Test Ban Could End Arms Race (Pavel Kuznetsov; Moscow in English to North America, 1 Jun 86)	43
TASS: U.S. Times Test for Environmental Protection Day (Moscow TASS, 5 Jun 86)	48
IZVESTIYA Editorial Article Assails U.S. Nuclear Testing Plans (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 4 Jun 86)	50
Stockholm Paper Cites Soviet Aides on Nordic NFZ (Harald Hamrin; Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER, 16 Apr 86)	54
Briefs	
TASS on French Mururoa Test	56

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: European Aspect of INF, CW, SDI, NFZ, MBFR Issues (A. Vtorov, Yu. Karellov; Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN, No 5, May 86)	57
Soviet Academician Interviewed on Climatic Effects of Nuclear War (Kirill Yakovlevich Kondratyev Interview; Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 29 Mar 86)	66
Canada: Peace Activists Lobby Clark at NATO Conference (Ottawa THE CITIZEN 29 May 86)	70
Canada: Poll Shows Majority Rejects Military Neutrality (Ottawa THE CITIZEN, 26 May 86)	71
Canada: Labrador Natives Against Goose Bay Expansion (Val Sears; Toronto THE TORONTO STAR, 29 May 86)	72

/7310

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: JAPANESE ROLE IN SDI VIOLATES TREATY

PM211342 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 May 86 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel D. Belskiy article under the rubric "The Facts Expose": "Dangerous Trajectory"]

[Text] The foreign press reports that Washington is harboring plans for some kind of "regional defense initiative" aimed at creating an antimissile defense with space-based elements in the Far East. By all accounts the "regional defense initiative" has been thought up as one of the options for implementing the plans to include Japan in the U.S. "star wars" program.

Washington has been harboring these plans for a long time. For more than 3 years a special "working group on international cooperation among industrial firms in the arms sphere," which is subordinate to the deputy defense secretary for research and design work and equipment, has existed under the U.S. Defense Department scientific and technical council. During 1983-85, its experts studied questions in Japan linked with obtaining the latest technology and expanding U.S.-Japanese scientific and technical cooperation.

A year ago, the Pentagon gave Japan a list that included around 50 types of equipment and modern technology the U.S. Defense Department is interested in obtaining. This list includes apparatus for detecting missiles in flight, lasers, fiber-optic and microwave equipment, microprocessors and infrared equipment, microcircuits for computers, computers using large integrated circuits, and much more.

It should be taken into account that the involvement of Japanese business in the implementation of SDI plans has been predetermined to a certain extent by the agreement on the exchange of advanced Japanese technology to the United States. Now, Washington is hoping to hitch Japanese industry to the U.S. military-industrial complex as strongly as the industry of certain West European NATO countries. In particular, the U.S. Administration is counting on concluding an intergovernmental agreement with Japan similar to that reached with the FRG. This agreement would regulate the procedure for including Japanese firms in research on the SDI program.

Meanwhile, U.S. military-industrial companies are having some success in establishing direct links with Japanese firms with a view to joint participation in the U.S. SDI. It is worth noting that the Japanese Government, while not yet having consented to participation in the "star wars" program, is at the same time not preventing the country's corporations from conducting direct talks on concluding contracts to carry out certain projects within the SDI framework.

Japan's participation in the "star wars" program has been supported from the outset by those circles that linked with companies producing military output. It is well known, for instance, that exploratory work on the creation of ICBM's is being carried out by the Nissan (Dzidosya) company. The Mitsubishi, Nippon (Denki), Ishikawajima-Harima, and other company also occupy leading positions in the implementation of missile and space programs. Tempted by generous Pentagon promises, the leaders of military business and government officials linked with them are demanding, contrary to the people's will, that Japan participate as quickly as possible in the "star wars" program. It is this recommendation that is contained, in particular, in the report given to the country's government by a delegation of Japanese officials and representatives of industrial circles that visited the United States in April with a view to studying both the "star wars" program itself and the specific conditions for Japanese participation in its implementation.

Tokyo would like to present the "Japanese formula" for involvement in SDI as some kind of harmless "collaboration." They are claiming importunately that it is not a question merely of studying the "fundamental opportunity for creating a defensive, nonnuclear, ABM system." However, the lasers and guidance systems for other missile-kill means already being created within the SDI framework -- and, incidentally, not without participation by Japanese firms -- are thought of in the Pentagon as part and parcel of space-strike arms and a component of the strategic forces intended for inflicting a nuclear first strike.

The SDI program envisages the utilization of the energy generated by a nuclear explosion as an integral element in space-strike weapons. The attempts to prove that x-ray lasers bear no relation to nuclear weapons seem naive. In this connection, THE JAPAN TIMES correctly wrote that the implementation of SDI would be suicidal for Japan. After all, the utilization of explosive nuclear devices forms the basis of the SDI technical concept.

Under a protocol signed last December, the United States is to obtain Japanese technology for the production of an optical guidance system for surface-to-air missiles ensuring a high strike rate. With slight modifications this system too could be used to create space weapons.

Japan's collaboration in the creation of U.S. space weapons does not accord with the spirit of the Nonproliferation Treaty to which it is a signatory. It would be a violation of the Treaty on the Peaceful Use of Space, signed by Japan in 1967, and it contravenes its nonnuclear principles and the principles banning weapon exports.

In other words, Japan's participation in the creation of space-strike arms would attest to the country's rejection of its obligations and would show that its policy is on an extremely dangerous trajectory.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1391

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW HITS BONN'S REJECTION OF GORBACHOV 15 JANUARY PROPOSAL

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Feb 86 p 5

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent Ye. Bovkun, Bonn: "Against the Current: In Bonn They are Attempting to Sow Distrust of the USSR's Peaceful Initiatives"]

[Text] Interest in the idea of building a nuclear-free civilization is demonstrated even in bourgeois circles in the FRG. Recently, for example, the complete text of CPSU CC General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's Statement was published in the newspaper FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, which reflects the opinion of large financial and industrial capital and is a supporter of the SDI.

No less symbolic was an article in the magazine STERN. "Can a communist be right?" its chief editor R. Winter asked in an editorial. He answered: "The leader in the Kremlin deserves applause. Never before in past decades has one statesman advanced such an all-embracing and radical proposal for the good of mankind." Objective assessments of the Soviet initiative can be heard from the most diverse people.

In contrast to this, official Bonn has taken a position clearly without considering either the opinion of its nation's public or the logic of detente. This position is based on the arguments of representatives of neoconservative thinking: proponents of "Star Wars" and those expressing the interests of the military-industrial complex. They are mainly politicians in the right-wing of the Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union.

Their attitude toward the USSR's new proposals was most thoroughly defined by F. Ruhe, deputy chairman of the CDU/CSU in the Bundestag. IZVESTIYA (No. 28) has already reported on a press conference arranged by him. It would apparently make sense to return to his arguments, however, since the "security policy" concept of official West German circles is presently based in great part on them. One senses a certain design in F. Ruhe's statements: to express as many general reservations as possible to avoid going deeply into the essence of the Soviet proposals.

This parliamentarian views their extensive publicizing primarily as "relying on propaganda," assuming that there will be realistic chances of achieving a compromise only if the interested parties discuss such matters confidentially in advance, in secret. But the Soviet Government came out against secret diplomacy in its Peace Decree. The USSR has never made its peace initiatives a subject of secret talks.

The Soviet proposals are clearly too general, it seems, and they need to be detailed to the maximum possible degree, the Bonn politician feels, in order then to discuss them individually. But how many specific measures advanced by the USSR for controlling the arms race has the West rejected in the past on the basis that they were "too particular"?

Take the following reservation. F. Ruhe tries to show that in order to resolve disarmament problems, it is necessary first to work to build up trust. He then turns around and demonstrates a certain distrust and suspicion. He does not believe that it would be possible in 15 years to get rid of weapons accumulated over a period of four decades and doubts Moscow's preparedness "to ensure an equal right to security for all of the states in Europe." The doubts are backed up with suggestions that the West may find itself at a "disadvantage," since, he says, there are no guarantees that Soviet tactical nuclear systems will actually be eliminated in the second phase of disarmament.

The question of trust is unquestionably a complex one. It was resolved long ago with respect to Soviet foreign policy, however. In 1922 Lenin told a British correspondent: "Our experience has produced in us the absolute conviction that only enormous attention to the interests of different nations eliminates the basis for conflicts, eliminates mutual distrust, eliminates fear of some sort of intrigues, and creates that trust... without which both peaceful relations among peoples and any sort of successful development of all that which is valuable in modern civilization are absolutely impossible."

And speaking of doubts, where is the guarantee that the USA, after creating the so-called "space shield," will not attack the USSR from space. It worked out the "Dropshot" plan, after all, and achieved a short-lived atomic monopoly. Considering the historic experience, the Soviet people have far more reasons to doubt the sincerity of intentions in Bonn, where they speak of "peace with the smallest quantity of weapons," while at the same time arming the Bundeswehr with offensive weapons, deploying Pershing and cruise missiles, and straining to take part in the oversea "Star Wars" plans.

The insuperable attraction of the military concerns for this space program, superprofits and militaristic ambitions--this is what is preventing Bonn from objectively assessing the situation. This is precisely why in Bonn they are using all possible means to demonstrate that the SDI "is better" than the Soviet proposal.

F. Ruhe lavishes praise upon Reagan's plan as the path to "objective devaluation of nuclear weapons." It is clear, however, that the ultimate goal of the "Star Wars" program is to "devalue" only the Soviet nuclear arsenals. NATO is not planning to give up its stocks, after all. FRG Defense Minister M. Worner recently underscored in the Bundestag that the total elimination of battlefield nuclear weapons in the immediate future does not conform to the interests of the North Atlantic alliance.

The leadership of the CDU/CSU has demonstrated once again that they totally share the ideas of the Washington hawks. It is as though F. Ruhe has attempted to separate the "grain" from the "weeds" in the peaceful Soviet proposals by sifting them through the screen of NATO concepts. The result was "constructive

elements" (that is, those which suit Bonn) on the one hand, and "problematic [elements]" (that is, those unacceptable to Bonn) on the other.

Just what are the Christian Democrats prepared to accept in the Soviet leader's Statement? First of all, that which can be interpreted as concessions.

Everything in conflict with the concept of achieving bilateral superiority is declared to be "problematic," however. Just what in the Soviet proposals suits Bonn the least? In the first place, the proposal that "third nations" (in this case, England and France) not build up their nuclear arsenals. It is all perfectly obvious. The FRG, which is actively developing military cooperation with its West European partners, is obviously hoping to obtain some degree of access to NATO's nuclear levers.

In the second place, F. Ruhe states that realization of the Soviet proposals would mean "consolidating the superiority" of the Warsaw Pact in conventional weapons, which, he would have it appear, are being factored out. They have apparently not carefully read the document in Bonn, however. It clearly speaks of the USSR's preparedness to have conventional weapons and armed forces also be an object of agreed-upon reductions.

The third "stumbling block," according to Ruhe, is the moratorium on nuclear explosions. This objection is understandable. After all, these tests are an element of the SDI program on which the Bonn conservatives place large stakes. And finally, the CDU/CSU leader seized the demand that implementation of the SDI be abandoned as the main obstacle to acceptance of the "Gorbachev concept," even though the danger of the "Star Wars" plans to the cause of peace and security of peoples is more than apparent.

The Federal Republic could play an important role in the process of improving the political climate in Europe. Many people here are thinking about possibilities for it to make a concrete contribution to detente.

Ruling circles in the FRG apparently do not want to listen to the voices of reason, however. Particularly since Bonn does not have its own original formulas for improving the international situation. And even the arguments against the Soviet initiatives are not distinguished by particular innovation. And where would new concepts come from, when the mode of thinking of the CDU/CSU leaders is defined by obsolete stereotypes. "The people and the politicians would not feel confident if the weapons which we have always recommended as an essential condition for greater security and stability were to suddenly disappear." This is how F. Ruhe expressed it in an interview conducted by the editors of DEUTCHLANDFUNK.

Albert Einstein spoke of the inevitability of human thinking's adaptation to the fact that nuclear weapons exist. Another revolution in the mass awareness is now objectively at hand, one requiring first of all rejection of the categories of confrontation and hostility and the resolute elimination of adventurous, militaristic concepts. The proponents of conservative thinking in Bonn resist new ideas. This accounts for their disinclination to carefully study the essence of the Soviet proposals, which consider in equal degree the security interests of the East and the West.

SALT/START ISSUES

SOVIET COMMENTS ASSAIL REAGAN SALT II DECISION

'Alarm' in U.S., Europe

PM301406 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 May 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report. "Undermining SALT II"]

[Text] New York, 29 May — President Reagan's statement on the U.S. intention to exceed the limits of SALT II later this year has met with alarm and concern among U.S. political and public figures, scientists, specialists in military affairs and Washington's European allies.

President Reagan "has basically declared war on arms control," Edward Markey, member of the U.S. House of Representatives, said.

He terms "irresponsible" the statement by the head of the administration on plans to begin by the end of the year, in breach of SALT II, the equipping of strategic B-52 bombers with cruise missiles.

The present master of the White House, Paul Warnke, former head of the U.S. delegation at the SALT talks, noted, "wants to bury the entire process of arms control." To all appearances, he stressed, this time "the maniacs have gained the upper hand" in debates on the stand to be taken regarding SALT II.

"By stating that he will no longer make decisions proceeding from the limits established by SALT II, the President is introducing a new element into already tense Soviet-American relations," the newspaper NEWSDAY writes. "In the opinion of specialists, the President's decision places in even more doubt the chances of making serious progress at the Soviet-American arms control talks in Geneva and undermines the prospects for holding a summit meeting between the USSR and the United States this year."

At the same time U.S. militarist circles have taken Reagan's statement as meaning one thing. The United States "is no longer bound" to continue observance of SALT II, U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger told journalists. "We are no longer tied to this mistake of an agreement. It is all very simple," he proclaimed.

An AP points out: In this connection, Weinberger's statements, "although to a considerable extent reiterating the statement by President Reagan, at the same time to an even greater extent attested that the decision to renounce SALT II has been quite definitely taken."

Weinberger: Limits 'Undesirable'

LD020535 Moscow TASS in English 0527 GMT 2 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 2 TASS — U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger, in an interview with the CBS TV network, has emphasized that the White House considers it undesirable to stay within the limits set by the SALT-2 treaty. He admitted that the limits prevented the United States from developing a new inter-continental ballistic missile, the Midgetman, and from continuing to build up all components of U.S. strategic forces. The U.S. secretary of defense pointed out that in certain areas, for example, the deployment of strategic bombers with cruise missiles on board, the United States would exceed the limits, stipulated by the SALT-2 treaty, in the near future.

Warnke Criticizes Decision

LD311025 Moscow TASS in English 0956 GMT 31 May 86

[Text] Washington May 31 TASS -- Delegates attending a Capitol Hill nuclear freeze campaign forum on defense and social policies demanded that President Reagan reconsider his decision to stop observing the SALT-2 treaty. They came out in favor of urgent arms limitation measures.

The renunciation of such an important document as SALT-2, said Paul Warnke, former director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, will "open floodgates for massive increases" in new nuclear arms. This will add nothing to the security of the United States, on the contrary it will leave it seriously undermined.

If the U.S. Administration goes over the Salt-2 limits the Soviet Union will invariably conclude, Warnke said, "that nuts have won" in Washington. "Nuts, I think, stands for nuclear utilization theorists, those that actually think that nuclear weapons are an instrument of military and foreign policy," he emphasized. By taking its decision administration officials "shot themselves in the foot -- they have taken very careful aim and hit the target," he said.

Warnke noted that the United States would slide over the treaty's limits by arming B-52 bombers with cruise missiles. He emphasized it was especially dangerous to go over the treaty's limits on intercontinental strategic missiles.

"I do not think," he added, "that the Soviet Union is so philanthropic as to spend money to scrap missiles" (in case the United States violates the relevant provisions of the treaty).

In the end, Paul Warnke said, the Soviet Union will increase the number of warheads on its missiles.

U.S. Submarine Launchings

OW310133 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1045 GMT 30 May 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vitaliy Ilyashenko]

[Text] The eighth nuclear Ohio class submarine has been launched in the United States. The huge craft, named "Nevada," carries 24 Trident ballistic missiles with MIRV nuclear warheads.

The world attentively watched what Washington would do as the commissioning of a new submarine violates the limits established by the Soviet-U.S. SALT II agreement. In order to observe the treaty, the United States must dismantle two obsolete Poseidon nuclear submarines. President Reagan went ahead with this in order, as he said, to contribute to the atmosphere of mutual restraint and create favorable conditions for arms reduction talks.

We could welcome the statement. Indeed, it is difficult to conduct one set of talks and disregard past agreements, but this logic was crushed by the President himself. In the same statement he said, and I am quoting, the United States long ago planned to remove and dismantle two of the oldest Poseidon submarines. If I was convinced, said the President, that keeping them in service substantially contributed to our national security and was economical, I would not have given the order to dismantle them.

So, the matter is not at all about Reagan's adherence to SALT II but is about the very high cost of repairing and modernizing obsolete Poseidon submarines.

Washington hawks were not pleased with the President's decision. The Pentagon chief, Weinberger, hastened to calm them. Speaking at a NATO session in Canada, he directly said that the United States intends to violate SALT II. In November, the Pentagon will begin deploying cruise missiles aboard 130 B-52 bombers, and then the United States will exceed the treaty limits. Caspar Weinberger told journalists: We are not longer bound by this flawed treaty. Everything is very simple.

Naturally, U.S. militaristic circles saw both the President's and the defense secretary's statements in the same light insofar as they coincided with their desire to open the gates for the most powerful arms race. The United States no longer remembers President Carter's words.

Carter said that SALT II was the most important step among those ever made for controlling nuclear arms. The current occupant of the White House, noted Paul Warnke, former head of the U.S. delegation to the SALT II talks, wants to bury the entire process of arms control. Judging from everything, he said, this time the maniacs have gotten the upper hand in the debate on the issue of respecting SALT II.

Bovin on U.S. Tridents

LD011840 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 1 Jun 86

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] You know, of course, that the United States did not ratify SALT II, and correspondingly, it did not come into force. Nevertheless, both the Soviet Union and the United States were adhering to the limitations envisaged in this treaty. That is, if

some new strategic armaments were introduced, that involved dismantling of certain quantities of old weapons, so to speak. Well, SALT II has a number of provisions, one of which prohibits each side from having more than 1200 MIRVed ballistic missiles. Until recently, the Americans had had 1,198 of such missiles.

Last Wednesday they started running trials of the Ohio-type submarines, each carrying 24 Trident missiles. That results in exceeding the limit by 22 units. The President has announced that two old Poseidon submarines will be dismantled, and one would think that everything is all right here arithmetically.

But no, -- the fact is, the White House declared that the decision on scrapping the old submarines was a purely political and not economic decision, because it would be quite complicated to modernize the old submarines, and they have concluded their service period anyway.

And the United States -- the White House -- has stated that it no longer deems itself bound by the limits of SALT II and it has been said specifically that when they start deploying additional B-52 bombers equipped with nuclear cruise missiles by the end of the year, they will not reckon with any limits specified in the treaty.

At the same time, Washington is referring to violations of the treaty by the Soviet Union, but these references are absolutely false: We are not and have not been overstepping the limits of the figures specified in the treaty.

The decision made by the White House practically cancels the last limitations that had been curbing the arms race in this way or another, and here is what U.S. Senator Edward Markey said on the subject: The government -- meaning his own government -- has declared a war on weapons control.

You are all, I presume, acquainted with the statement of the Soviet Government in this connection, and I would quote a small, essential paragraph from this statement: Therefore, what the Soviet Union was warning about has occurred -- the U.S. Administration, out of all possible variants of its conduct in respect to treaties and accords that limit strategic armaments, has adopted exactly the one that undermines the foundation of the process of limiting and reducing such weapons.

Well, it is not coincidental that even U.S. NATO allies became alarmed.

PRAVDA Cites XINHUA, AP

PM051541 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS article: "Urgent Warning, World Press on USSR Government Statement"]

[Excerpts] The Soviet Union's statement in connection with the virtual U.S. refusal to observe in future the Soviet-U.S. legal treaty documents on strategic offensive arms control -- the interim 1972 agreement and the 1979 SALT II treaty -- has attracted great attention worldwide.

The Soviet Government has stated that as soon as the United States exceeds the arms levels laid down by SALT II the Soviet Union will consider itself relieved of its corresponding obligations and will take the necessary practical measures to prevent the undermining of military-strategic parity, XINHUA stresses in a commentary. The

newspaper RENMIN RIBAO describes the U.S. Government's decision to start deploying new arms, including bombers equipped with cruise missiles, at the end of this year as "an important revision of U.S. policy" and a "step that attests that the United States will no longer observe the provisions of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty." "This decision of Reagan's," the newspaper notes, "has disappointed both the members of the U.S. Government and Congressmen advocating the establishment of arms control." In their opinion, the newspaper writes, President Reagan's decision "could put the arms race out of control."

United States

The White House has not yet given an official reply to the Soviet Government statement. The ASSOCIATED PRESS reports that in a talk with journalists White House spokesman E. Djerejian touched on the question of the Soviet Government statement. Rejecting the conclusions contained in the Soviet statement without adducing any proof, he again tried to pin the blame on others by claiming that President Reagan had allegedly "traveled his part of the way to meet the USSR over the last 4 years."

At the same time sober-minded Americans are assessing the Reagan administration's intention to abandon observance of the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty as an attempt to pave the way for an unbridled buildup in nuclear arsenals.

Gromyko Terms Decision 'Gaffe'

AU030802 Paris AFP in English 0753 GMT 3 Jun 86

[Excerpts] Moscow, June 3 (AFP) - Soviet President Andrey Gromyko sees Washington's decision to stop automatically respecting all its 1979 SALT-2 treaty with Moscow as a major gaffe, British MP Martin Flanery said after a Kremlin visit.

Mr. Gromyko, the former long-serving foreign minister, added that Soviet leaders did not believe U.S. opinion really agreed the treaty should be broken up, Mr. Flanery (Labour), here with a British all-party delegation, added.

Mr. Gromyko's comments, as reported by Mr. Flanery, were not included in a long official report of the Kremlin meeting, carried by the media Tuesday.

The British delegation met Mr. Gromyko for two-and-a-half hours here Monday, after talks with Soviet party chief Mikhail Gorbachev last week.

Bovin Scores U.S. Stance

PM021403 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Bovin "Political Observer's Opinion": "Gulf"]

[Text] From time to time it is useful to examine old papers or books read long ago. As a rule, something interesting and needed in the present can always be derived from them. So permit me to quote: "Human reason is incomplete, hence the inevitable divergence between the world as it is and our image of it. As long as our image is close to objective reality we are able to solve our problems in a sensible and appropriate manner. But when our image fails to tally with events, when we refuse to

believe what we do not like, what scares us, or simply what we find entirely unfamiliar, the discrepancy between the facts and our image of them turns into an insuperable gulf and our actions become foolish and inappropriate." Those words were spoken more than 20 years ago, on 25 March 1964, to be exact. They were spoken in the U.S. Senate by James W. Fulbright, the well-known politician.

Much has changed since then. There was a time when the American image of the world "as it is" approximated to objective reality. Although that time was short-lived, it left us, in particular, the SALT I and II agreements and the ABM Treaty -- documents that have proved the fundamental possibility of reaching agreement on the most important and delicate of political questions.

But, I repeat, that time was short-lived. In the second half of the seventies the discrepancy between fact and image started growing and, after the appearance of the current President in the White House, turned into an "insuperable gulf." If Washington is the beloved city of the "Almighty" then the "Devil" is undoubtedly Moscow. Everything not to the Reagan administration's liking, everything that scared it and that it did not understand has been ascribed to machinations and intrigues and seen as the "reds'" ineradicable desire to take over the entire world.

Last week a TV talk was organized between the U.S. President and American students. The naive students asked the President: "If the United States and Russia have created enough arms to completely wipe each other out why are we still spending colossal sums on building up our defense potential?" The President replied: "We are forced to believe that the Soviet Union is pursuing an expansionist policy."

"It holds the conviction that its aim must be to develop world revolution until a world communist state is formed." The President needs such a willful interpretation of Soviet foreign policy aims and the substitution of historical philosophy with a kind of historical mythology in order to substantiate and justify the striking difference between words and deeds. The words are about the usefulness of disarmament and the desire for disarmament. The deeds however, are to build up arms and block disarmament talks.

In complete violation of logic and the objective trends of military rivalry it is claimed in Washington that only by transferring "defense efforts" to space, that is -- to call a spade a spade -- by militarizing space, can the conditions for disarmament be created on earth. The "star wars" program is now a symbol of U.S. militarism, which is already short of room on earth, at sea, and in the air...

Some \$3.05 billion were allocated for research within the SDI framework in fiscal 1986. In fiscal 1987, the administration is asking for this sum to be increased by 77 percent. However, the launch of billion-dollar sums into space is starting to embarrass many Americans. The other day 46 senators (37 Democrats and 9 Republicans) protested the star wastefulness and demanded that the growth of SDI appropriations be increased by only 3 percent. The administration recoiled. The squabbling continues.

The arguments about the military potential of space are being accompanied by the active "modernization" of what already exists on earth. This is exacerbating again and again the question of the observance of the limitations imposed by the Interim SALT I agreement and the SALT II agreement. This is not a trivial situation. SALT I has long since expired. But SALT II has not come into force at all, because the Americans refused to ratify it. Nonetheless, up until now both sides in principle took into account the provisions of these documents. Thus, in order not to overstep the limits contained in them, the USSR dismantled 540 strategic delivery vehicle units when siting new arms and the United States dismantled 168 such vehicles.

This week the Pentagon noted that start of sea trials of the eighth Trident-class submarine. It contains 24 MIRVed ballistic missiles. This will mean that the limit for strategic delivery vehicles laid down by SALT II will have been surpassed. In order to prevent this it is necessary to dismantle two old Poseidon submarines. And this decision was made.

However, this was by no means done out of a partiality for arms limitation, rather for purely economic reasons. For strategic bombers are being equipped with nuclear-armed cruise missiles at the same time. "Since production of the new long-range B-1 bomber and the B-52 modernization program are in full swing," the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL wrote recently, "the opponents of SALT II believe that the dismantling of both Poseidon submarines is not such a tragic event, even the contrary. For them the dismantling decision is rather a sign that Reagan ... intends to tear up the arms agreement no later than next December." That is what has happened. It has been announced that by year's end, the United States intends to exceed the limits set by SALT II. To exceed them, needless to say, in order to strengthen U.S. security and weaken Soviet security. That pathetic calculation is yet further evidence that the images of U.S. politicians, to recall Fulbright's argument, "do not tally with the development of events" and fail to take into account the specifics of the nuclear age and the stability and steadiness of military-strategic parity.

A clear-cut political assessment of what has happened was given in the recent Soviet Government statement. "Thus, what the Soviet Union was warning against has happened. Of all the options for possible action regarding the treaties and agreements limiting strategic arms the U.S. Administration has chosen precisely the one that undermines the foundations of the process for limiting and reducing such arms. Faced with the choice of moderating its own arms programs or opening the floodgates for an uncontrolled arms race, Washington has preferred the latter."

Stating that the United States will no longer take into account the restrictions stemming from SALT II, the U.S. President is consciously and deliberately moving affairs toward a deterioration in Soviet-U.S. relations and the intensification of international tension. This has triggered a veritable rumpus in NATO. At the organization's council session the U.S. allies criticized the White House decision in one way or another. Shultz, the U.S. newspapers wrote, was isolated. But the latest token resistance will hardly influence Washington.

The "senselessness and inappropriateness" of U.S. policy is seen in the pursuit not only of nuclear but also chemical superiority. The Pentagon insisted that the production of new-generation combat toxins (binary weapons) be launched. Congress hesitated. In the end the following decision was made: The funds for the production of binary weapons would only be allocated if the NATO allies agreed.

The action moved from Washington to Brussels. The Americans went all out. They argued that chemical weapons would be produced and stockpiled in the United States; only in the event of crisis situations would they be transferred to Western Europe. Ultimately the NATO Military Planning Committee approved the U.S. plan last Thursday. At the same time Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Greece, Iceland, and Luxembourg stated that they would not permit chemical weapons to be sited on their territories. The FRG and Britain are reckoned to be the first candidates for the siting. K. Voigt, the prominent Social Democratic Party figure, called 22 May a "black day" for disarmament in Europe.

On the whole, armed forces are being built up in all directions. The conceptual basis of this policy is as old as the world, or rather, as the world of traditions continued by today's Washington -- the use of force to settle political disputes. That force is used wherever Washington can count on overwhelming military superiority. Libya is the latest example.

The Americans presented the attack on the "den of terrorism" and the bombing of Tripoli and Benghazi as a model of a policy illuminated by lofty moral principles. What kind of morality this is was indicated by South Africa, which organized armed raids against Zambia, Botswana, and Zimbabwe. Recalling the Israeli strike against PLO headquarters in Tunis and the U.S. strike against Libya, South African President P. Botha stated: "Like the United States and all other civilized governments, we reject organized terrorism on a world scale. Equally, we will not tolerate terrorists hiding in other countries with the intention of carrying out crimes against our country's people." When the White House incumbent did not accept the kiss from his South African colleague and when Washington explained that what is permitted Jupiter is not permitted Botha, Pretoria was indignant: "South Africa," the South African president said, "will not allow double standards and hypocrisy from the West, even in respect of legal principles, to stand in the way of our obligation to defend our country." He added: "South Africa will unhesitatingly take such actions in the future." A bad example is indeed catching.

Hypnotizing itself with its almighty power and the seeming impunity of its use, Washington does not want to realize that power that is not endowed with reason and fails to take the general trend of sociopolitical changes into account, inevitably leads to an overall deterioration in the international situation. Washington may suppose that the complication of Soviet-U.S. relations continually provoked by U.S. show of force strengthens U.S. foreign policy positions and makes U.S. security more stable. If that is so the gulf between the actual state of affairs and the current administration's impression of it really is insuperable.

In an attempt to reassure public opinion and create the impression that the strong-arm policy of the White House is not causing a deterioration in Soviet-U.S. relations, officials in Washington are referring to the meetings of Soviet and American experts on the problems of chemical weapons, on risk reduction centers [po tsentram shizheniya riska], and on the situation in southern Africa and Central America.

They recall that similar meetings are being prepared on the Near East and East Asia. This is all true. These meetings have been held and, clearly, will continue to be. But it is not hard to realize that the future of Soviet-U.S. relations does not hinge on consultations concerning individual, albeit very important, questions of world policy. The future of Soviet-U.S. relations depends on the state of affairs in the central part of world policy -- I am thinking of the arms race and the reduction of military potentials, first and foremost nuclear potentials. By not realizing this, or pretending that it does not realize it, and by not attempting to overcome the gulf between reality and myth and between the objective demands of the age and its own prejudices, illusions, and bias, the U.S. Administration is eliminating the hopes that arose after Geneva.

Zholkver Marks U.S. Attitude

L1022222 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1443 GMT 2 Jun 86

[From "The World Today" presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] Hello comrades! The Soviet Government statement regarding the U.S. refusal to continue to adhere to the Soviet-U.S. agreements on limiting strategic armaments is the center of attention of international observers today.

In Vienna, in June 1979, I had a chance to witness the signing of the second Soviet-U.S. treaty on limiting strategic arms at the Soviet-U.S. summit. Although it was unfortunately never ratified by the United States -- because of resistance by the U.S. military-industrial complex, -- both sides still adhered to its tenets, and this served as an essential barrier to an arms race. And now, President Reagan has announced the refusal of the United States to adhere either to the 1972 agreement or SALT I⁷.

Paul Warnke, one of the veterans of U.S. diplomacy, who in his time headed the U.S. delegation to the Soviet-U.S. talks on SALT II, called this action by the Washington administration a mad policy. Noting the fact that the bureaucrats who came to the White House under Reagan have never been advocates of arms control, Warnke arrived at a grim conclusion: At this stage, madmen have won.

Nevertheless, this madness has its own logic, the logic of the military-industrial complex. Its plans are rendered in detail in the U.S. report on arms control and disarmament that has just been sent by the President to the Congress. I would like to make it clear from the start that, contrary to the official name of the agency, the report does not deal with arms control at all, and is even further from dealing with disarmament; on the contrary, it deals with a massive buildup of armaments by the United States. Here is but a brief list of some basic military programs contained in this report: another 50 ICBM's, in addition to the 50 already planned; development of another, the 14th, nuclear submarine of the Trident class; and, as the report goes, the full-scale development and manufacturing of 100 strategic bombers -- the B-1B. A special section of the report is devoted to the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative; in other words, putting into space various types of weapons -- kinetic, beam, and even nuclear ones. The report does not make any bones about the fact that nuclear tests provide an opportunity to update nuclear armaments. Such are the basic features of Washington's arms race program.

It is hardly surprising then that the Pentagon's boss, Weinberger, bluntly speaks about the undesirability of adhering to the limitations established by SALT II. A curious nuance: Weinberger has just created a special post in the Pentagon, a supervisor of the program for purchasing armaments, with the rank of a deputy secretary.

What is even more revealing, Richard Godwin, an old friend of Weinberger and vice president of the Bechtel Corporation, one of the largest companies in California, has been appointed to this post. I can only add that Weinberger was vice chairman of the same firm prior to ascending to the post of the Pentagon's boss in 1981. So now, the direct path from the Pentagon's leadership to the leading U.S. monopolies will be even shorter.

Pasko Hits Reagan Decision

1D072155 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 2 Jun 86

[Vladimir Pasko commentary from the "International Diary" program presented by Vladimir Fadeyev]

[Text] It is said that when the U.S. President announced his intention concerning SALT II at a meeting in Tokyo of the leaders of the major capitalist countries, UK Prime minister Thatcher, resolutely, though without excessive fuss, expressed her protest to Reagan. The same was done by other participants at the meeting. The President promised to take their opinion into consideration. It is known now how that was done. The U.S. abandonment of SALT II is planned for the end of the year when, in the process of deploying new arms, particularly heavy bombers with cruise missiles, the United States oversteps the limits established in the treaty at 1,320 units for strategic MIRV's. The President bluntly stated that the United States will not dismantle the appropriate quantity of armaments to prevent it from exceeding that level.

The President's reaction to the Soviet Government statement was to be expected: SALT II has come to limit the arms race, has set limits on certain nuclear weapons systems, and has narrowed the sphere of their proliferation. Observing its provisions on a mutual basis would continue to be very significant for maintaining the strategic balance and for ensuring conducive conditions for elaborating new accords on limiting and cutting back on arms.

As a member of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, Markey stated: By his decision, the President has essentially declared war on arms control. The former leaders of the U.S. delegation at the SALT talks, Smith and Warnke, and former Defense Secretary McNamara have expressed the same reservations. Delight in the White House chief's decision could be heard only in the camp of militarists. We are no longer tied to this flawed document, the Pentagon boss stated after the President's speech.

For those who make a living out of military business, the SALT agreement has become an obstacle to new profits. Describing the struggle in Congress surrounding SALT, THE WASHINGTON POST wrote on the day of Reagan's statement: When the decision is made at the end of the year on this treaty, it will be a matter of the whole system of nuclear forces. The Pentagon intends to make a decision on the production of the mobile ICBM, the Midgetman, which has several warheads; Weinberger also announced that the Air Force intends to modify all its B-52 aircraft to carry cruise missiles. Bombers, cruise missiles, Midgetmen, MX's, space-strike weapons in the framework of the notorious star wars program -- they are pressing [oni pressinguyut] across the whole spectrum.

The newspaper quotes the words of a high-ranking congressional official who, as it notes, is inclined to support SALT: What is happening now in Washington reveals once again and quite obviously the essence of the current U.S. policy, a policy for a world arms race, militarization, and the winding up international tension. In its decision to refuse to observe further the accords with the Soviet Union, the U.S. leadership is taking a dangerous step.

Our country, as the Soviet Government states, will not look on detached as the United States smashes up the agreements achieved in the field of strategic offensive arms limitation. The U.S. side must have no illusions that it will manage to achieve military advantages for itself at the expense of others' security. The Soviet Union will continue to take all measures for reliably ensuring the security of the socialist commonwealth and will continue to do everything needed to strengthen international security.

U.S. Charges Refuted

PM051316 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Jun 86 First Edition p 3

[Article by A. Mozgovoy: "Contrary to Common Sense: Washington's Logic"]

[Excerpt] In order to justify their virtual refusal to observe in the future the Soviet-American treaties on strategic offensive arms limitation (SALT I and SALT II), representatives of the American Administration are accusing the Soviet Union of violating agreements, without adducing any proof. It is being claimed, in particular, that the USSR has allegedly developed and immediately deployed two new types of ICBMs, which is prohibited by SALT II.

But this is deception! Washington is passing off as the second "new type" the Soviet RS-12M missile (SS-25 in NATO terminology), which is only a modernized version of the old RS-12 missile. In terms of its weight characteristics, dimensions, number of stages, and of fuel type, that is, all the conditions stipulated by SALT II, the RS-12M missile is quite within the modernization limits stipulated by the treaty. This is also acknowledged by authoritative American strategic arms specialists. Thus, Jack Mendelsohn, a member of the U.S. delegation at the SALT talks, writes that "modifications to existing missiles are permitted as long as they do not go beyond the bounds of the limitations."

The same Mendelsohn also points out another absurdity in the accusations against the USSR which relate to the encryption of telemetric information in missile tests. "SALT II directly permits the encryption of telemetry," the American expert stresses, "and prohibits it only when it impedes monitoring of the observance of treaty obligations." The Soviet Union does not encipher parameters bearing on the monitoring of fulfillment of the SALT II provisions. What is more, we have more than once proposed to U.S. representatives that they name the parameters which, in their opinion, should not be coded. But a refusal was the response, because this question is supposedly "too secret for discussion."

Other such "accusations" addressed to us also fail to stand up to criticism. They are simply not based on facts. Not without reason American General Richard Ellis said recently at hearings in the U.S. Congress House of Representatives Intelligence Committee that the Soviet Union conscientiously observes its treaty obligations. This cannot be said of the United States itself. Washington long ago embarked on a path of gradually worming its way out of SALT II. Contrary to Article XII of the treaty, which prohibits circumvention of the treaty in any manner, the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles has begun in Western Europe -- these missiles being strategic means in relation to USSR territory. The United States has organized the production and mass deployment of long-range cruise missiles. American military and industrial corporations are creating a new ICBM -- the "Midgetman" -- which is really the second since the MX [as published]. The United States is constantly violating the clause on not using deliberate camouflage which complicates monitoring. And now it is planning to break the treaty system altogether.

Korionov Raps U.S. 'Hawks'

PM031425 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 86 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Korionov "Commentator's Column": "The Wreckers"]

[Text] In Western Europe, Asia and other parts of the world, and in the United States itself there is mounting condemnation of the White House decision announced a few days ago about the de facto refusal of the United States to continue to abide by Soviet-American agreements of paramount importance for strategic offensive arms limitation -- the 1972 Interim Agreement [SALT I] and the 1979 SALT II agreement.

Under a barrage of sharp criticism, the administration's spokesmen are claiming that the U.S. Administration "has traveled one more mile" in the sphere of arms control. True, the administration has traveled another mile, however, in the wrong direction, in the direction of wrecking the very foundation of the process of limiting and reducing nuclear arsenals.

The President, Congressman E. Markey noted, "has effectively declared war on arms control." Senator A. Gore added: "Arms control is hanging by a thread." The head of the White House, the British FINANCIAL TIMES writes, "is definitively undermining the foundations of one of the main curbs on the arms race." Western observers are almost unanimous in their assessment that the "hawks" who have long been trying to wreck the Soviet-American agreements that to a certain extent restrain the most dangerous type of arms race have gained the upper hand in Washington.

While certain administration officials are trying to assure people that the United States will finally withdraw from SALT II only in, say, fall or toward the end of the year. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger is saying that the United States "is no longer bound" by SALT II.

However, it is not only a question of the fate of the aforementioned document. The "hawks'" plan go much further than that. They regard the abandonment of SALT II as a major step toward wrecking everything positive that has been achieved with great difficulty in the cause of normalizing Soviet-American relations in past years. Some far-sighted people in the United States are warning that the administration has set its sights not only on SALT II but also the 1972 ABM Treaty.

These are all dangerous symptoms. Essentially it is a question of attempts to poison the general atmosphere in Soviet-American relations to such an extent as to render the continuation of the Soviet-American dialogue at the summit level impossible.

The forces that seek to preserve peace and curb the arms race cannot but draw the appropriate conclusions from the actions of the Washington administration.

Kornilov Sees Danger

LD031428 Moscow TASS in English 1357 GMT 3 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS -- TASS Political News Analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

President Reagan's decision to break out of the SALT-2 treaty is the most serious blunder made over the entire period of his stay in the White House. This has been stated by Senator Edward Kennedy, a prominent U.S. public figure, in a speech in the

Senate. Mr Kennedy's statement is consonant with pronouncements by many other sober-minded political figures of the West, and with the opinions of prominent scientists, authoritative military experts, and members of the public at large of various countries, including that of the USA. And there can be no other estimate of Washington's actions.

What is in actual fact the essence of the U.S. President's recent statement on a virtual refusal to be bound by the SALT agreements in the future? The essence is that the strategic offensive arms' ceilings set by the agreements no longer suit those U.S. circles which count on force, and steer matters towards a further build-up of U.S. military might. Washington seeks to remove the 'handbrakes'. Such is the 'logic' of militarist policy.

The U.S. President's decision signifies that the U.S. leadership has gone to an exceptionally dangerous measure in the cause of destroying the treaty system which restrains the nuclear arms race and thereby brings about conditions for the conclusion of new agreements. The U.S. decision signifies that the U.S. Administration is openly proclaiming a course towards full implementation of a nuclear arms build-up programme adopted by it.

Commenting on Washington's militarist action, many observers and press media emphasise that it fully fits into the framework of the U.S. global foreign policy. And this is really so. In December 1984 U.S. President Ronald Reagan declared on the pages of a New York monthly, "AMERICAN PIGEON MAGAZINE," that nuclear war was unwinnable and it should not be started. Such were the words but what is the real policy of Washington and what is its reply to the Soviet peace initiatives? In response to the call for preventing a transfer of the arms race to outer space, and for turning the near-earth space into an arena of peaceful and mutually beneficial scientific cooperation, Washington replied with a speeded-up preparation for 'star wars'. In response to the proposal to ban nuclear weapon testing, Washington replied with new nuclear tests in Nevada. In response to the calls for a ban on barbarous chemical weapons, Washington replied with sanctioning the production of a new-generation of chemical weapon -- the binary round.

The purpose of those actions is the same: At all costs, by all means to upset the established military-strategic parity in the world for the purpose of dictating U.S. will to sovereign countries and peoples upon getting a nuclear space sword, the longer and sharper the better. The leader of U.S. Communists, Gus Hall, points out that the country has never had an administration which would so actively pursue an aggressive imperialist policy as the present one.

Of course, the Soviet Union cannot and will not watch indifferently how the United States feverishly replenishes its already packed-to-capacity military arsenals with new and new types and systems of destructive weapons, and upsets the reached agreements and accords. Our country has always found -- and undoubtedly will continue to find -- an effective reply to any challenge on the part of those who would like to test once again our military and technological capabilities.

But the line towards competing against each other in the production of tools of destruction and death, pushing the world closer and closer to the abyss of a nuclear conflagration is not our choice. That line runs counter to common sense and gives rise to mounting counteraction by all peace-loving countries and all peoples that are aware of the stern realities of the nuclear age. The world has become too small and too brittle for wars and any kind of 'stratagems of power politics'. The people unanimously demand that the militarists be stopped, and that a turn to real steps to curb the arms race be secured.

Ambassador to UK Comments

LD031338 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1255 GMT 3 Jun 86

[By Tom McMullan, PA political staff]

[Text] The Soviet ambassador, Mr Leonid Zamyatin, in London today repeated before British television cameras and journalists Soviet anger at President Reagan's threat to break the SALT 2 agreement which limits the strategic nuclear weapons held by the two superpowers.

He renewed the Soviet appeal to Britain to use her influence with the U.S. to prevent President Reagan going ahead with his threat by the end of the year. New political thinking was needed, he said.

Observers noted that, despite the expressions of anger, the ambassador did not rule out a summit between President Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and listed subjects on which there might be scope for agreement.

Mr Zamyatin said at a press conference that Britain and the Soviet Union had "a very good experience of cooperation." He recalled the trilateral talks between 1977 and 1980 on the ban on nuclear tests when a number of agreements were signed.

He said: "The situation in the world is so complicated and tense it requires new political approaches, new political thinking and new efforts in order to curb the arms race. We think that Great Britain has its own point of view on many international issues and problems."

Britain was probably aware to a greater extent than any other country of the U.S. position on major international issues. Cooperation by the British would be very much appreciated by the international community, "whether this helped to achieve compliance with existing treaties on arms control or curbed the arms race."

The ambassador said he had discussed yesterday with Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe the possible visit to London of Soviet Foreign Minister Mr Eduard Shevardnadze. They had not fixed a date, but talked of a visit in the middle or end of July.

He denied the Soviet Union had breached the provisions of the SALT 2 agreement. If the Americans breached the agreement, the Soviet Union would consider herself free from obligations and would not allow the undermining of military strategic parity. "The USSR will provide reliable security to socialist states," he said.

At any summit between Mr Gorbachev and President Reagan there should be measures which would strengthen international security and lead to a curb on the arms race. The ambassador indicated that a summit need not be confined only to nuclear issues. He said: "We would put forward major proposals concerning the reduction of conventional weapons and forces in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

"These proposals would be detailed and comprehensive. If we could agree on these questions, that would be a very good beginning for the summit.

"We do not see the second summit with the U.S. President as a forum where we can agree on all the problems.

"There is a possibility of agreeing on a ban on nuclear tests. We can agree on chemical weapons. We can agree on confidence-building measures. We can easily agree on the question of intermediate nuclear missiles."

Views Violations

LN031925 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 3 Jun 86

[Text] London June 3 TASS -- A briefing for representatives of the British mass media was held at the Soviet Embassy here. The attention of journalists was drawn to the May 31 Soviet Government statement in connection with the actual refusal of the United States to abide in future by the Soviet-American treaty documents on the limitation of strategic offensive arms.

When questions were answered at the briefing it was stressed that this step by Washington unambiguously characterises the American foreign policy as being directed at further intensifying the arms race, militarising outer space and aggravating international tension. The present American leadership has taken an exceptionally dangerous measure in the direction of destroying the treaty system that restricts the nuclear arms race and thereby creates conditions for concluding new accords. The attempts of the United States to justify this course by references to some "violations" of existing agreements by the Soviet Union were refuted as totally groundless at the briefing. The Soviet side proceeds from the premise that a continued observance on a mutual basis of the commitments stipulated by the agreements would be of substantial importance for maintaining the strategic balance and strengthening security.

It was stressed at the same time that the Soviet Government will not watch impassively as the United States wrecks the system of agreements reached in the field of limiting strategic offensive arms. The American side will not succeed in achieving military advantages for itself at the expense of others.

It was noted at the briefing that Britain -- and the Soviet Union has accumulated good experience of cooperation with it, in particular at the tripartite talks on prohibiting nuclear tests -- could play an important role in efforts directed at curbing the arms race.

Discussion at UN Tbilisi Conference

PM041426 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[Political Observer Yuriy Zhukov article: "Wreckers" -- Uppercase paragraphs printed in boldface]

[Text] ALARM ALL OVER THE WORLD HAS BEEN INTENSIFIED BY THE U.S. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE INTENTION TO ABANDON BY THE END OF THIS YEAR SOME OF THE MOST IMPORTANT AGREEMENTS WHICH, FOR MANY YEARS ON END, ENSURED THE OBSERVANCE OF THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUALITY AND EQUAL SECURITY WHICH WAS ACCEPTED BY THE SOVIET UNION AND THE UNITED STATES IN MAY 1972.

IT IS WELL KNOWN THAT, AT THE MEETING IN THE CANADIAN CITY OF HALIFAX, EVEN THE NATO ALLIES DECLARED FOR EVERYONE TO HEAR THEIR DISAGREEMENT WITH THIS DECISION, WHICH MARKS A NEW AND DANGEROUS ZIGZAG IN U.S. POLICY FRAUGHT WITH UNPREDICTABLE CONSEQUENCES. NOW EVERYONE CAN SEE THAT THE UPPER HAND IN WASHINGTON HAS BEEN GAINED BY THE MOST REACTIONARY CIRCLES, WHICH HAVE DECIDED TO WRECK THE ENTIRE SYSTEM OF TREATIES AIMED AT ENSURING ARMS CONTROL.

Literally just a few days before the U.S. President's sensational statement, I had an opportunity to unintentionally witness the striking disregard for the world public's opinion with which these professional political wreckers commit their truly criminal deeds.

This happened in Tbilisi, where a regional UN conference on disarmament problems, the 12th so far, was being held.

Naturally, the participants in the conference showed the greatest interest in the stance of the two greatest powers in the world -- the USSR and the United States. The Soviet viewpoint was outlined by the secretary general of the USSR Foreign Ministry, but a strange hitch suddenly developed regarding the U.S. viewpoint: The U.S. Government had promised the UN Secretariat that it would send the deputy director of Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to Tbilisi, but he canceled his plans at the last moment.

This fact alone was sufficient to put the conference's participants on their guard, and caused a certain degree of alarm among them. This alarm intensified on the 2d day, when official reports reached Tbilisi that the U.S. Administration had refused to take part in another important UN conference due to be held in Paris. That was the "Disarmament and Development" conference.

How is one to explain this flagrant and, I would say, provocative behavior by the Washington leadership which, disregarding the UN initiatives, stubbornly boycotts, one after the other, the UN forums devoted to disarmament problems? Much was said on this subject in the Tbilisi conference lobbies. The majority of participants agreed that people in Washington have evidently drawn the conclusion that the growing worldwide popularity of Soviet peace initiatives, which are stubbornly rejected by the U.S. Government, makes it politically disadvantageous and even dangerous for Washington to attend any events in the course of which disarmament problems are to be discussed — after all, the U.S. spokesmen have nothing to say in justification of their negative stance!

Even if anyone still had any doubts on this account, they were dispelled on the last day of the conference when British Prof B. Buzan, one of the few participants in the debates who undertook the unenviable role of defending the U.S. stance in the absence of U.S. Government spokesmen, suddenly made the following program declaration:

"Disarmament," he said, "is a pipe dream [neeffektivnyy zamysel]. It is impracticable, and for the public this subject is unattractive -- it is too complex. There must be no confusion between goals and the means to attain them. A mistake was made when the World Disarmament Campaign was launched. It is necessary to pose not the question of disarmament, but a much broader concept -- the ensuring of security, which requires weapons. Security must be built on the basis of the idea of nonaggressive defense..."

This advocate of the opponents of disarmament was immediately backed by J. Simon, spokesman for the U.S. "National Defense College."

Both defenders of the U.S. stance were rebuffed decisively and right away.

"Your concept," Indian Ambassador M. Rasgotra declared, "is unlawful and erroneous. Disarmament is of vital importance for us. The people must force governments to embark on disarmament. As far as my country is concerned, the public and the government are unanimous on this issue: All Indians are against the arms race."

In this way, the Tbilisi conference demonstrated perfectly clearly the political will of the governments and peoples playing an active part in the World Disarmament Campaign organized by the United Nations for the achievement of agreements to end the absurd and dangerous arms race. But Washington considers it far from expedient to take into account either the opinion of the overwhelming majority of states on our planet or world public opinion. In the past few days, people there were already poring over the compilation of texts for statements by U.S. leaders and documents proclaiming determination to break all arms limitation agreements.

The U.S. President was the first to announce this intention. In his extensive statement published on 27 May, he announced that Washington intends, as early as the end of this year, to exceed the nuclear arms limits set by SALT II and that the United States will not be bound by the norms laid down in the treaty.

This unprecedented statement was backed by a whole series of statements by lower-ranking Washington figures. On the very next day, 28 May, the notorious Jeane Kirkpatrick who claims the role of the present administration's spiritual mentor, in an article published by THE WASHINGTON POST, assailed American "liberals" who demand the observance of agreements with the USSR signed by the current U.S. President's predecessors. She called for all previous arms limitation agreements to be disregarded, and for an end to be put to attempts to conclude new ones because, you see, "it is impossible to reach an accord on the observance of agreements."

On the very same day, another Washington "hawk" -- Defense Secretary C. Weinberger -- categorically declared in a speech at the West Point Military Academy that the United States will no longer honor SALT II which he maliciously described, following in the President's footsteps, as "flawed" [porochnyy].

On the next day, according to UPI reports, Secretary of State G. Shultz in his turn declared at the NATO Council session in the city of Halifax (Canada) that "the Reagan administration has finally decided to abrogate the SALT II agreement."

After all this, it is easy to understand the confusion that has gripped the U.S. allies, who have been given graphic proof of the results of their constant connivance with the Washington wreckers of international law who are trying to replace it with "the law of the jungle."

According to AFP reports, the new U.S. stance, "of which the allies were not informed (!) before the NATO Council session, has generated fully understandable alarm and even hostility among the Europeans." Even the most loyal U.S. allies declared at that session their disagreement with the U.S. Administration's decision.

Canadian Prime Minister B. Mulroney spoke against it and, following him, Canadian Foreign Minister J. Clark declared at the NATO Council session: "It is our belief that observance of the limits of SALT II meets the interests of arms control... It is premature to bury it."

British Foreign Secretary G. Howe, according to ABC-TV reports, claimed that SALT II "is an important part of the arms control system" and that "his country does not want to see it wrecked."

FRC Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher spoke in the same vein, while V. Ruehe, deputy chairman of the Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union parliamentary faction, speaking at a press conference, criticized Washington for its "thoughtless withdrawal" from SALT II, warned the United States against nonobservance of the treaty, and emphasized that this issue requires a joint decision by all NATO countries.

Explaining the differences between the United States and its partners on this issue, THE WASHINGTON POST wrote on 31 March: "The allies fear that a U.S. repudiation of the policy of voluntary observance of the treaty would undermine European confidence in the United States and would revive strong antinuclear feelings in the NATO countries."

The Soviet Government's statement that it will not remain a passive bystander while the United States wrecks accords that have been achieved, and that the U.S. side should have no illusions that it may succeed in gaining military advantages for itself at the expense of the security of others, has intensified still further Europe's awareness of how adventurous and dangerous Washington's decision is. Nevertheless, those who now determine U.S. policy remain deaf to the world public's protests. Speaking a few days ago in an interview on U.S. television, C. Weinberger left no doubts that the U.S. Government intends to disregard the allies' statements, being confident that they will make a bit of noise and will then calm down. But people in NATO countries' capitals now do have something to think about. One thing is evident for the time being: All the U.S. allies, as THE WASHINGTON POST admitted, are against the Washington administration's decision. The question is, however: What lies behind this word, "against?" In the newspaper's words, the U.S. allies only "express the hope (!) that the decision announced in Washington... will not be implemented."

What can be said to this? Blessed are the believers, as the saying goes. It is hardly likely, however, that any serious politicians could expect such a miracle. The world is now at a dangerous line, beyond which lies the minefield of a totally uncontrolled arms race. What is demanded of all sober-minded people is not a high-flown "expression of hopes" but energetic and purposeful actions whose aim is to force the Washington "hawks" to halt.

West European Opposition

0W051405 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0200 GMT 5 Jun 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; Yuriy Ulyanov commentary]

[Text] The West European public is resolutely opposed to the abrogation of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on limiting strategic strike weapons, SALT II. Our commentary:

[Ulyanov] Hello, comrades. I have in front of me a report just received over the editorial office's teletype. Roy Hattersley, deputy leader of the Labour Party, has come out with criticism of the U.S. decision to discontinue observance of the SALT II treaty in the House of Commons of the British Parliament. He said that the Government of Great Britain must demand that U.S. President Reagan strictly observe the provisions of this most important agreement.

A report from New York says that West European journalists working in the United States described as frightening President Reagan's decision to abrogate the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty. Appearing on a CNN TV information program, they emphasised that this White House step will create major political difficulties for ruling parties in some West European countries. Indeed, ruling circles in the West have found themselves in a difficult situation.

Washington has again announced a decision of very great importance for the destiny of the world without consulting its NATO allies. And this is far from being the first time. Without going far back in history, it suffices to mention the veto imposed by the United States on the final document of the recent conference of experts on contacts between people held in Bern. That document was discussed and preliminarily agreed upon by all the delegations. It was supported by U.S. allies. Yet Washington, defying all, said no at the last moment.

Of course, the White House views criticism from NATO countries as subdued mutiny, and it can hardly have any substantial effect on the general spirit of U.S. imperialistic policy. How can anyone, after this, accuse the Soviet Union that it allegedly tries to drive a wedge between the United States and Western Europe. We only state the facts.

Administration 'Propaganda'

LD051656 Moscow TASS in English 1629 GMT 5 Jun 86

["The 'Logic' of Opponents of Detente -- News Analysis" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev:

The Soviet Union-advanced wide-scale program for averting a nuclear holocaust, establishing a comprehensive system of international security and eliminating the mass annihilation weapons as early as before the end of the current century receives a broad backing the world over. The U.S.S.R's constructive proposals at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on nuclear and space arms -- the proposals which make it possible to embark on the road of real disarmament without delay -- are also widely known.

But the stronger this backing the more vigorous Washington's efforts are to keep the existing tensions in international relations at the same level and to poison the political climate in the world. One of the steps taken by Washington in this direction was President Reagan's announcement about the U.S. refusal to observe SALT-1 and SALT-2 agreements in the future.

In view of the fact that world public opinion strongly condemned U.S. actions the administration would like to obscure to a maximum the meaning and the underlying motives of the decision taken. High-ranking Washington officials, specifically U.S.

Secretary of State George Shultz, Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Edward Rowney, special adviser to the President and the secretary of state, made a series of statements and interviews loaded with propaganda.

In a bid to justify the decision taken by the White House they distorted the real state of affairs and used arguments devoid of any logic.

Each of the mentioned speakers invented his own version of the motives and the meaning of Washington's measures to destroy the foundation of the process of arms limitation and reduction. However, an odd thesis underlies all these "explanations" -- the cause of arms limitation and reduction would be better off without the SALT-2 treaty than with it. But, then, there is nothing "odd" in it. This thesis "logically" arises from the fundamental principle of the policy of the present administration which has repeatedly maintained that the rearmament of the United States would promote the success of disarmament talks.

In this connection, it is appropriate to ask -- can one trust those who maintain that the higher the stockpiles of U.S. weapons on earth the stronger the peace, those who demolish the foundation of a building, saying in the process that they intend to build a building without a foundation? Of course not!

The unilateral denunciation of commitments under major international legal documents -- the move made by the American leadership -- attests to the desire to torpedo the process of arms limitation and reduction and fails to provide any evidence of attempts to "better it."

It is also appropriate to remind the present White House incumbent the words of his predecessor, President Carter, who, before the signing of the SALT-2 treaty, spoke aptly of the consequences which the U.S. renunciation of the treaty would entail.

President Carter said that the U.S. would lose its ability to appeal successfully to the hearts and minds of all other nations of the world and would play the role of instigator of war who refused to take part in the joint effort to limit the buildup of the most destructive weapons which mankind had ever known.

The White House has forgotten this warning. The American leadership has chosen the policy of intensifying the arms race and undermining strategic stability. Despite numerous pronouncements made by U.S. Administration officials to the effect that the United States would like to get rid of the burden of nuclear weapons, concrete actions taken by Washington bear witness to its political unpreparedness for taking concrete steps with a view to easing international tensions and eliminating nuclear weapons.

/9716

CSO: 5200/1404

SALT/START ISSUES

XINHUA REPORTS U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS STRAINED BY SALT II FEUD

OW040020 Beijing XINHUA in English 0001 GMT 4 Jun 86

[Round-up: U.S. Policy Shift on Salt II Brings About New Quarrels (by Shi Lujia) -- XINHUA headline]

[Text] Washington, June 3 (XINHUA) -- A series of disputes between Moscow and Washington have strained U.S.-Soviet relations since the beginning of this year on issues relevant to nuclear disarmament. Now, a new quarrel over the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II) is fueling these disputes and overshadowing the prospect of a new Soviet-U.S. summit scheduled for later this year.

SALT II was signed by the late Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev and former U.S. President Jimmy Carter in 1979 after eight years of hard negotiation. After the Soviets invaded Afghanistan in late 1979, the U.S. Senate refused to ratify the SALT II agreement.

President Ronald Reagan has been a vocal opponent to the treaty, calling it "fatally flawed" and an agreement that would do nothing good for the United States. However, because of pressure from domestic public opinion and U.S. allies and differences within the administration, Reagan declared the United States would not undercut this treaty as long as the Soviet Union abides by it.

Then on May 27, Reagan announced that since the Soviets frequently have violated the treaty, the United States would take the "nature and magnitude" of the Soviet threat as the starting point in its development of nuclear forces instead of following restrictions set up by SALT II. But, he said, the policy would not be put into effect for the time being and whether the U.S. would adhere to the treaty depends on Soviet behavior in the following months.

Some newspapers observed that the administration shifted its stand on SALT II because Washington wanted to apply pressure to the Soviets to get the arms control talks in Geneva moving off their sluggish pace. Other newspapers argued that Reagan's statement was only a move with which the administration would please the conservatives at home.

Secretary of State George Shultz termed the change as a "shift of gears" in U.S. arms policy.

Marking a strong response from Moscow, the Soviet official news agency TASS in a commentary May 28 charged the United States with harboring an attempt to "ensure unilateral military advantages."

Some Soviet officials declared that the Soviet Union should take necessary countermeasures to defend itself and its allies if the United States abandoned SALT II. They also threatened that holding the second Soviet-American summit was in jeopardy as long as Washington sticks to its current policy on the SALT II treaty.

Last weekend, Moscow warned in a sharply worded statement that the Soviet Union no longer would be bound by the two SALT treaties and would take necessary measures to prevent the strategic equilibrium from being damaged once Reagan puts his May 27 decision into effect.

Some American politicians and West European allies have expressed reservations about the shift in U.S. policy.

According to some people, including Robert McNamara, former U.S. defense secretary during the Vietnam war, to undermine SALT II would mean abandoning the arms control structure established by four U.S. presidents in the last 20 years. And, these experts said, it would spark a surge in the arms race. During a meeting of NATO foreign ministers that closed May 30, almost all the Western Europe representatives demanded Washington reconsider its SALT II stand.

Washington intended to force Moscow to make concessions in Geneva, some American newspapers wrote, but the policy change probably would offer a chance for Moscow to launch a new propaganda campaign -- accusing Washington of having no interest in arms control and making it more difficult for any progress at the Geneva talks.

/6091
CSO: 5200/4040

SALT/START ISSUES

CANADA: NATO FOREIGN MINISTERS DISCUSS SALT II ISSUE

Lord Carrington, Clark Remarks

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 29 May 86 pp A1, A20

[Article by Jim Robb]

[Text]

HALIFAX — NATO's secretary general launched a sharp attack on the vagueness of Soviet arms control proposals as foreign ministers of the western alliance gathered here Wednesday for their regular spring conference under tight security.

Lord Carrington termed the much-heralded disarmament proposals put forward earlier this year by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev "nebulous" and said it's time the Soviets put forward "real" proposals at arms talks.

"There's been too little of substance so far in what the Soviet Union has said," the NATO chief told a press conference.

The NATO foreign ministers are holding two days of mostly secret sessions today and Friday on disarmament, co-operation to stamp out state-supported terrorism, and improving alliance unity.

This is the first of their spring conferences held in Canada since 1974 and the first in a provincial capital.

Police ringed the World Trade Centre where the conference is taking place and everyone entering the building had to pass through metal detectors. As ministers arrived, surrounding streets were closed to traffic.

Lord Carrington gave strong support to President Ronald Reagan's statement this week that the United States will continue complying with terms of the SALT II treaty by scrapping two Poseidon missile submarines when one of the new Trident-class vessels takes to sea in the near future, to

keep U.S. missile strength within treaty limits.

Reagan also said, however, that the U.S. will not in future observe the agreement because of alleged Soviet violations.

The NATO head suggested that the west generally has overlooked proposals by the United States for arms reductions because of fascination with Gorbachev's call for an end to nuclear weapons by the year 2000 coupled with much reduced conventional forces in Europe.

"The United States has put forward some extremely forward-looking proposals" but people, Carrington said, "somehow or other have forgotten that and have concentrated on the rather nebulous proposals which Mr. Gorbachev has put forward. "They are nebulous until such time as you see something much more concrete on a piece of paper," he said.

"If these are real proposals they should be discussed at Geneva," where the superpowers are discussing reductions in strategic nuclear weapons.

Reagan's decision to abide by the SALT II treaty limitations on nuclear warheads is a "challenge" to the Soviet Union, he said, because the Americans have complained for years that they are abiding by the treaty, never ratified by the U.S., while the Soviets have infringed its terms.

"The United States has been pretty patient... what this shows, frankly, is that there is a challenge to the Soviet Union... before the end of the year to try to do something about non-compliance." The U.S. has proposed at Geneva that strategic nuclear forces be reduced 50 per cent and longer-range intermediate weapons be abolished completely.

Carrington termed Soviet verification proposals to monitor reduction of conventional forces by East and West in Europe at arms talks in Vienna as "very inadequate."

The NATO head played down rifts in the 16-nation alliance caused by European unhappiness with the U.S. air raid on Libya in retaliation for terrorist attacks.

France and Spain refused the U.S. permission to fly F-111 fighter-bombers through their air space after they were sent aloft from bases in the United Kingdom.

Carrington said later that some of the discontent was caused by a different view of which country bore most responsibility for the terrorist attacks that prompted the American raid.

He said that while the Americans believed Libya was responsible and had to be taught a lesson, European countries viewed Syria as the more serious offender.

Prime Minister Brian Mulroney and External Affairs Minister Joe Clark arrived for the two-day conference Wednesday.

Mulroney was to hold a working breakfast meeting with the foreign ministers today just before the conference was formally opened by Carrington and Clark.

When he arrived, Clark told reporters that Canada has urged the United States to observe the arms limits imposed by Salt II.

Referring to Reagan's threat to break out of the Salt II limitations by the end of the year unless the Soviets end violations of the treaty, Clark reiterated Canada's objections to any non-compliance with Salt II by either superpower.

"We have expressed our view very strongly to the United States that we think it is in everyone's interest that the limits under Salt II be respected," he said.

"Arms limitation requires compliance by both sides. We have made that case strongly to the Soviet Union as well."

Clark mistakenly referred to a Soviet radar array at Krasnoyarsk as a Salt II violation (it actually, according to the United States, breaches the Anti Ballistic Missile treaty) and said "there are a number of other questions that we think provide evidence of non-compliance. We've raised them with the Soviets, we've asked them to respond."

First Day Sessions

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 30 May 86 pp A1, A4

[Article by Val Sears]

[Text]

HALIFAX — The NATO foreign ministers, alarmed by Washington's threat to break the SALT II treaty limiting nuclear arms, have joined forces against the United States in an apparently doomed effort to save the crumbling pact.

In an all-day session of the alliance's political executive here, the U.S. alone defended its position that the treaty with the Soviet Union has "outlived its usefulness"

and should be scrapped.

The American delegation said that while SALT II had great "symbolic significance" for Europe, it was overrated. They said it could no longer play a useful role in arms limitation.

No choice

External Affairs Minister Joe Clark called the U.S. decision a "profoundly disturbing development and one we hoped could have

been avoided."

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz argued that the Soviet Union had broken terms of the agreement, forcing the U.S. to do the same.

The United States never ratified the treaty, which controls the number and type of nuclear missiles, but until now has stuck to its terms.

While the sessions yesterday

were secret, it was clear from briefings by various delegations that the U.S. position had left it isolated.

A British spokesman, for example, said: "Britain wants the U.S. to stay within the limits of SALT II; we made that plain as a pikestaff."

Dutch Foreign Minister Hans van den Brock said he would find it "an alarming situation" if Washington broke the treaty.

While President Ronald Reagan suggested that the United States might stick with the terms if the Soviet Union agreed to comply, it seemed clear here that the pact was dead.

The U.S. has charged that the Kremlin broke the treaty terms in three areas:

- Stationing a new missile, the SS-25;
- Coding its testing information from launches so that the U.S. could not read it;
- Building a radar station as defence against missiles.

Clark, who led off the discussions yesterday, told a the formal opening session: "It is of fundamental importance that parties to arms-control agreements comply fully with the terms of those agreements."

He said he regrets that Soviet non-compliance had forced the United States to ditch the treaty terms.

While the North Atlantic Treaty Organization split on the SALT II issue, it was united in its admiration for the political guile of Soviet Premier Mikhail Gorbachev.

"The ministers agreed he was a very shrewd political operator," a Canadian spokesman said.

"He knows how to play upon

Western public opinion."

The ministers conceded that Gorbachev's skill required them to make the Western case in a more persuasive way.

At a private luncheon meeting — with no staff attending — the ministers also agreed that NATO was an appropriate forum to discuss the fight against terrorism.

Clark said earlier that "the last thing we want is to see international terrorism succeed, where the Soviet Union has failed, in dividing us."

There appeared to be agreement that intelligence information about terrorism would be shared, not only in Europe, but with Canada and the United States.

A Canadian spokesman said that as a result of yesterday's discussions, "there was a greater understanding of the various differences."

Unity threatened

NATO's unity had been threatened by the American raid on Libya and the French and Spanish refusal to allow American planes to fly over their countries.

In a private, bilateral discussion following the main sessions, Clark met with the British foreign secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, to discuss South Africa.

While Howe was said to have been adamant that Britain would not apply economic sanctions against South Africa, the pair agreed to wait for a commission of so-called "eminent persons" to report before any action at all was taken.

Clark accepted an invitation from Howe to visit Britain for talks in December.

/9274
CSO: 5220/40

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET OFFICIAL ASSERTS VERIFICATION NO LONGER PROBLEM

PM041335 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 May 86 First Edition p 3

[L. Semeyko article under the "Events and Opinions" rubric: "Stopping the Nuclear Chariot"]

[Text] Today the problems of the peaceful and military use of the atom have fused into one. The accident at the Chernobyl AES has shown once again what awesome power nuclear energy can unleash when out of control. Concerted action by all countries is needed to ensure the safe harnessing of the great power contained within the nucleus of the atom. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's constructive proposals on deepening cooperation within the IAEA are directed precisely to that end.

At the same time the Soviet Union and the world public are convinced that the task of curbing the military use of the atom is immeasurably more important. The consequences of its being out of control would no longer be local but global in nature and would involve not isolated casualties but many hundreds of millions of human lives lost. Therein lies mankind's main anxiety. And all the various enemies of peace will not manage to shift the stress in people's awareness from the task of disarmament, and above all an immediate end to nuclear tests, to the artificially inflated problems of Chernobyl.

Stopping nuclear tests essentially means closing down the forge in which the latest means of nuclear destruction are manufactured. That is where the business of large-scale disarmament must begin. That would be the most understandable and accessible step, and would moreover be without adverse effect on the balance of the sides' nuclear might or anyone's security. The elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe and the ending of nuclear tests are the basic links which, once grasped, would make it possible to begin right now solving the whole chain of problems involved in really strengthening international and national security.

The latest extension of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests -- this time through 6 August of this year -- affords yet another real opportunity to solve not only very quickly and once and for all the problems of a general and complete ban on nuclear tests but -- and this is the main thing! -- also to start steadily reducing the nuclear threat facing mankind. Saying "no" to new nuclear tests means saying "yes" to progress toward a nuclear-free world and actually demonstrating one's commitment to the noble goal of eliminating nuclear weapons.

But so far Washington has refused to take the correct step. Will it ever agree to do so? The question is a serious one. We are not losing hope but neither are we slackening our vigilance. Giving the Americans a chance, even several chances, is our duty, and the USSR is discharging it.

Since the Soviet agreement to on-site verification [kontrol] of a nuclear test ban, Washington has been divested of the fig leaf that it has clutched to itself for almost a quarter of a century while refusing to ban underground nuclear explosions.

It is now clear to all that the "problem" of verification [kontrol] has ceased to be a problem. Moreover, Washington has long been aware that any nuclear explosion can be detected. People there do not see "unreliable" verification [kontrol] as the danger. "Even if a general nuclear test ban can be verified [prokontrolirovat] it will run contrary to U.S. national security interests," Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Atomic Energy) R. Wagner told Congress. There's the rub! And Washington has now taken up those interests like a drowning man snatching at a straw. It is claimed that tests are required for as long as nuclear weapons exist and the latter are required for "deterrence." But this is the logic of people who are actually intent on perpetuating rather than eliminating nuclear weapons and on ensuring security by military-technical means rather than political measures. After all, it is always possible to "justify" a "threat to the security" of the United States and consequently not only retain nuclear weapons but modernize them ad infinitum. Which means a nonstop arms race. Since the conclusion of the Limited Test Ban Treaty (1963) 28 new types of nuclear combat munitions have been developed [razrabotano] in the United States. The latest in the line include nuclear-pumped X-ray lasers.

America's nuclear plans are causing justified concern not only to us but to sensible Americans too. The tests scheduled in the United States are not just for modernization. They are for the purpose of strategic rearmament to acquire the ability to deliver a disarming first strike. And such a course leads to the strengthening of neither American nor, even less, international security.

Our country has already demonstrated its readiness to stop nuclear tests and thereby its practical readiness for the phased elimination of nuclear arsenals. Let us recall that last July the USSR declared a moratorium on nuclear tests from 6 August through 1 January 1986 and agreed to extend it still further if the United States joined in. At the beginning of this year the moratorium was extended through 31 March and, after a certain time, for a period beyond that deadline -- until the first nuclear explosion in the United States. On 14 May M.S. Gorbachev declared that the decision had been made to extend the Soviet unilateral moratorium through 6 August of this year. This succession of examples of a true love of peace and this series of actions are designed to influence the political thinking of those who govern across the Atlantic.

The Soviet moratorium is the latest manifestation of the new political thinking that is so necessary if lasting security is really to be ensured. This thinking, reinforced by action, represents a breakthrough in the strategy of war prevention.

On looking at and pondering Washington's policy we now also see a change, albeit a formal and purely tactical one. Previously when Washington refused to ban nuclear tests it cited "verification [kontrol] difficulties," whereas now it cites the need to "ensure security." What is the difference? It comes to virtually the same thing: Nuclear tests have been continued and will continue. But tests, strictly scientifically speaking, are

not needed to maintain nuclear arsenals at combat readiness. There are other means available for that. This has been shown by American specialists, particularly the physicist R. Garvin, who took part in the creation of the first American hydrogen bomb.

Moscow has repeatedly proposed an urgent [bezotlagatelnyy] meeting between the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President to solve the problems of halting nuclear tests. The problem is too serious to be postponed. After all, we could, as of tomorrow, reach agreement on fundamentally important steps in this sphere to break the deadlock. And then there would also be the other, previously planned summit meeting, where accord could be reached on other disarmament problems. Only the political will is needed to make step-by-step progress, overcoming the obstacles of mistrust, suspicion, and enmity, and demonstrating by practical deeds the readiness for new approaches in world politics.

In the prevailing conditions, where attention is so intensely focused on nuclear questions, you must be able to learn lessons. Lessons from Chernobyl. Lessons from American actions since Geneva, including their systematic refusal of a complete and decisive ban on holding further nuclear tests. Lessons from frequent American accidents involving missile and nuclear equipment that occurred in the distant and also quite recent past. And lessons too from the intentions of America "to worm its way out of" the ABM and Salt II treaties.

Mindful of the real situation, the USSR is doing its utmost to avert the worst. That cannot be said of the United States, whose actions are incompatible with political morality and common sense. It is time it was realized that to live today in terms of past is to commit a crime against the future.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1403

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PRAVDA CORRESPONDENT ON U.S. MOTIVES FOR OPPOSING MORATORIUM

PM301057 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 May 86 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Gan report: "What For? Washington Against the Moratorium"]

[Excerpt] Washington, May — Many letters have recently arrived at PRAVDA's Washington correspondents center from American citizens, as well as statements by prominent public figures and members of the U.S. Congress. All the letters convey roughly the same feelings. This is not surprising when you realize that it could not be otherwise. The Smiths, Browns, and Johnsons, like millions of their neighbors in the world, are equally grieved and alarmed by the realization that their common home could collapse into the abyss at any moment.

While I was writing these lines, it was announced on the radio that there had been another explosion at the Nevada test range, the 4th this year and the 11th since the imposition of the Soviet moratorium. The tests, as an official spokesman for the U.S. Department of Energy announced, "were related to armaments." That is the administration's latest answer to the new appeal made by the USSR, which has extended its moratorium until 6 August — the anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima.

The annual report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to the U.S. Congress has been published here. The report sets forth officially, in documentary form, the government's position on questions of military developments, foreign policy, and its approach to Soviet-American talks. It makes things out to be better than they are. "Considerations regarding limitations on nuclear tests continue to be taken into account in U.S. policy," it declares. There is not a shadow of truth in that statement. In fact, Washington has shut itself off completely from Soviet appeals to turn these benevolent "considerations" into the long awaited practical actions. So the administration starts dodging, evading, putting forward banal excuses and at times outright lies.

The report claims, in particular, that the continuation of nuclear tests is necessary in order to "ensure the effectiveness of our deterrence forces and the reliability and safety of the U.S. nuclear arsenal." "In view of the scope and scale of the buildup of the Soviet Armed Forces," it says, "it is vitally important that we safeguard the strategic balance that has helped us preserve peace between East and West all these years." And further: "Nuclear tests help to ensure confidence in our deterrence forces by making it possible to modernize our nuclear arms."

But, first, the Soviet Union has never threatened anyone, and the "Soviet military threat" is an idle fabrication. Second, it was not U.S. actions which helped to "ensure peace" throughout these years, but the policy of the USSR and the other socialist countries.

What is absolutely true in the report is that nuclear tests do indeed make it possible to carry out arms modernization. This modernization is taking place in line with Washington's course of securing military-strategic advantages and wrecking the approximate parity of forces between the USSR and the United States. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that in recent years a situation has arisen in the country where, as one newspaper put it, "the government does not control arms, arms controls the government."

Washington's obstructionist approach to a nuclear test ban and to disarmament questions is based on the fantastic profits flowing into the military-industrial complex. There is even an expression on Wall Street -- "New frontiers of profit." You only have to glance at the figures relating to the contracts of just the leading Pentagon contractors for it to become clear what this means. Last year, for instance, the McDonnell Douglas corporation received military orders worth \$8.9 billion, General Dynamics \$7.4 billion, Rockwell International \$6.3 billion, General Electric \$5.9 billion, and Boeing \$5.5 billion.

Here it is of some importance to note that hundreds of millions of dollars were received for the development [razrabotka] of qualitatively new types of arms, which is the purpose of some of the nuclear tests. In particular, within the framework of the "star wars" program alone, the Pentagon has already given out contracts worth \$2 billion. When you take into account that according to the most approximate estimates the cost of the plans for space militarization will amount to \$2 trillion purely in the initial period, one can say without fear of exaggeration: The administration's decision not to ban nuclear tests was taken at the headquarters of the military-industrial corporations. How can there be any question of a moratorium, of an awareness of civic and political responsibility, when you are plunged into a paradise of dollars? After all, the adoption of the moratorium would mean a significant step toward curbing the arms race.

What could then be done with the x-ray and optical lasers for "star wars," the microwave guns, the Midgetman charges and charges for Trident-2, and the dozens, if not hundreds, of other programs?

The answer is obvious. That is why it is rare for a day to go by without the American press reporting more and more new requests from the administration -- first for several billion more dollars to "expand capacities for the production of nuclear weapons," then for \$2 billion to "improve the Nevada test complex," then for funds to "study the question of whether the United States should develop a new mobile missile with cluster warheads," then something else in the same vein. And the number of explosions in Nevada grows. "Whereas formerly about 6 explosions were usually needed in order to create a new weapon," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, "work on just one of today's more complex types of arms can take 100-200 explosions."

All this is connected with the political decision, made in favor of the military-industrial complex, to raise the nuclear arms race to a qualitatively new and, therefore, still more dangerous level. Of course, a Soviet-American moratorium would hamper this. C. Pell, senator from Rhode Island, incidentally pointed this out during the hearings now taking place in Congress on the question of banning nuclear explosions.

However, the appeals and demands to see reason and at last display responsibility make no impact on the administration. The military-industrial complex lobbyists stick to their guns and assure us that a test ban "would do absolutely nothing for nuclear disarmament" (Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Admiral W. Crowe), that "a world free from nuclear arms is not practicable" (Assistant Defense Secretary R. Perle), that "the moratorium on nuclear tests proposed by the USSR is an invitation to a total ban on explosions, which is not verifiable" (R. (Bekker), deputy assistant director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency).

Upon going to Congress and hearing such remarks, you realize how right B. Frank, member of the House of Representatives, is when he says that "the barrier in the path of progress is no longer the lack of the technology for verification, it is the deliberate policy of Washington." There is no arguing with the conclusion of journalist M. Kinsli, who wrote that "the administration's supposed arguments to explain its rejection of Soviet proposals for a total nuclear test ban exude insincerity."

It should be added that it is not only a question of insincerity. By rejecting the USSR's responsible, constructive step, the U.S. Administration provided unambiguous evidence that it puts the interest of military-industrial circles above the interests of its own people and of all mankind. Yet the nuclear age demands new political thinking and a new policy. To close your eyes to this and refuse to take account of the realities of the present day is to commit an unforgivable error that it will be difficult, and perhaps downright impossible, to rectify.

/9716

CSO: 5200/1403

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

INDIAN PRIME MINISTER PRAISES NUCLEAR MORATORIUM EXTENSION

LD190717 Moscow TASS in English 0528 GMT 19 May 86

[Article by TASS correspondent Vladimir Baidashin--TASS byline]

[Text] New Delhi, May 19 TASS--Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, expressed wholehearted support for the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing till August 6.

Speaking to newsmen at the Delhi Airport after returning from a tour of several African nations, he said that decision had demonstrated that the Soviet Union's attitude to nuclear disarmament was most serious.

Answering questions from this correspondent, he said that the next meeting of six nations of five continents on nuclear disarmament would take place on August 6 and the participants at that meeting hoped that other nuclear powers would also take constructive steps similar to the ones taken by the Soviet Union.

On a recent reply by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to a message from the leaders of the six nations of five continents, Rajiv Gandhi said the Soviet Union always reacted positively to the initiatives of those countries on nuclear disarmament.

Sometimes the Soviet Union went even further than those nations asked it to and they hailed that attitude.

Some people claimed, Rajiv Gandhi said, that the Soviet Union did all that for propaganda purposes. The six nations, however, would like to see similar "propaganda" on the part of also other countries. But other nuclear powers, regrettably, had not reacted in a similar way to the six nations' proposals.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1403

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S. DEFIES PUBLIC OPINION ON TEST BAN

'Shameless Lies'

LD212324 Moscow TASS in English 1406 GMT 21 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 25 TASS--Follows commentary by Yuriy Kornilov, TASS political news analyst:

A collection of materials presented to Congress reflecting the stand of the U.S. Administration on the key disarmament issues has been issued in Washington. The collection of documents says that Washington further intends to carry on nuclear weapons testing. This was also reaffirmed by Richard Perle, U.S. assistant secretary of defence. Speaking in Washington, he said that this year the USA would conduct at least 15 nuclear blasts.

This militaristic line is clearly in conflict with the explicitly expressed will of an overwhelming majority of nations of the world. Sensible political figures in the United States itself even more often point to the danger of this policy. With every new test the USA makes a step back in the process of arms control, Senator Edward Kennedy pointed with the good reason.

The returns of the public opinion poll carried out in the USA by the "Opinion Research Corporation" are evidence that 60 per cent of American favour an end to nuclear blasts. Yet, apparently, the stand of American public means nothing to those in Washington, who in forming the fundamentals of United States policy proceed not from the interests of peace, not from the national interests of their own country, but lay emphasis on the selfish and imperial ambition of the military industry complex.

"Propaganda support" has been ensured for Washington's militaristic policy, which is based on illusory, but extremely dangerous calculations to break by all means the military strategic parity in their favour.

While all sensible people received the news of the Chernobyl tragedy as another tolling of the bell, as another stern warning that this nuclear age requires new political mentality and new policy, certain U.S. and NATO circles see in what has happened only a fresh opportunity to put up additional obstacles in the way of development of the East-West dialogue, to justify the nuclear weapons race, to try to discredit the USSR and its peaceable policy.

In issuing shameless lies about our country, malevolent cock-and bull stories about the Chernobyl accident, they are trying to lessen the international impact of the Soviet proposals on an end to nuclear testing, on the elimination of nuclear weapons and at the same time bring down the mounting criticism of the conduct of the USA itself.

Now after the Soviet Union has extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing till August 6, it is obvious to every sane person that if the U.S. Administration responded to that good initiative, made a step, which is expected from it by all peoples, the possibility of putting an end to all nuclear blasts and consequently the possibility to start movement towards the elimination of nuclear weapons would become quite real.

The paramount significance of that objective was obvious in the past, the more so it is obvious today after the Chernobyl accident has once again demonstrated what abyss will open if nuclear war breaks out.

Yet through Washington's fault, the USSR's unilateral moratorium has not become bilateral and not stopped the conduct of nuclear tests, at least so far. This fact most clearly shows who is really for eliminating the nuclear threat and who, while getting away with pseudo peace-making rhetoric, continue building up their nuclear arsenals feverishly, are banking on a further increase in the potential of the mass destruction weapons.

Today the U.S. ruling circles and those who support their policy, have again a real opportunity to display a sense of realism and responsibility and demonstrate not just by word of mouth, but in action their goodwill. As far as the Soviet land is concerned it is deeply convinced that an end should be put to nuclear testing.

'Deaf to World Opinion'

OW230404 Moscow Television Service 0200 GMT 23 May 86

[From the Novosti newscast; Serikov commentary]

[Text] The new U.S. nuclear explosion was met with resolute condemnation by the world. Our commentator.

[Serikov] Hello comrades. Only a week has passed since the day our country announced its extension of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing. Once again we have shown our good intentions, our determination to explore all possibilities, and our desire to influence by example the U.S. position on the nuclear question. The new constructive proposals of the Soviet Union were met by a large and positive response, which is understandable, seeing that they are consistent with the hopes and aspirations of the people of the world.

However large the tragedy at Chernobyl, it in no way compares to the ramifications of the scope of the numerous catastrophes hidden in nuclear arsenals stockpiled around the world. Understanding this, many government and social

figures have highly evaluated our position. An act of unprecedented state wisdom was what Professor Bernard Lown, cochairman of the doctors against nuclear war movement, called the decision of the Soviet Union.

However, the White House is remaining, once again, deaf to the demands of world opinion--or is pretending that it is deaf, for it is hard to believe that only the explosions on the Nevada test site can be heard there, while other explosions, those of indignation and outrage, are being totally ignored. Yesterday's nuclear test was the eleventh such test by the United States since 6 August 1985 when we introduced the unilateral moratorium. It is the eleventh time Washington has mocked the most valued and natural wish of the people to live. By this act, Washington has proven the anti-human essence of its policies.

The mayor of Nagasaki, the victim-city of a U.S. atomic bombardment, made a strong protest to the U.S. Government and demanded an immediate end to all nuclear explosions. All honest people of the world are lending their voices to this protest.

Protest in Nevada

LD311441 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT 31 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS--By TASS news analyst Vassiliy Kharkov:

A protest demonstration which American peace campaigners plan to stage near the Pentagon's test range in Nevada Saturday and next Monday comes as fresh proof of the fact that the movement for a nuclear test ban is gathering momentum in the United States.

Many anti-war organizations and groups are among the organizers of the demonstration which is expected to be a representative one with many people participating.

It is noteworthy that peace activists from other countries, notably Great Britain, West Germany, Japan, New Zealand and others, expressed the desire to take part.

It is symbolic that such a massive demonstration will be held near the test range in the Nevada desert where the Pentagon has been modernizing nuclear weapons for many years now. It shows that broad sections of the American public deplore the administration's reluctance to terminate nuclear testing and its desire to continue intensifying the nuclear arms race.

Millions of Americans welcomed the gesture of goodwill made by the Soviet Union which extended unilaterally its moratorium on nuclear explosions for the third time -- till next August 6. The question why Washington refuses to follow the Soviet Union's noble example, as THE BOSTON GLOBE newspaper admitted, can be heard ever more often across the United States, characterizing the sentiments of many Americans.

But Americans are not simply asking this question. They are increasingly aware of the fact that vigorous actions and large-scale demonstrations are required to make Washington reckon with desire of the American people and with the striving of the international community for the termination of the arms race that threatens mankind with a nuclear holocaust.

More and more people from different walks of life join in the movement in the United States for the termination of nuclear tests and for a bilateral Soviet-American moratorium. These are religious figures, prominent scientists, public figures and politicians, congressmen, and others. Opinion polls taken in the United States show that a majority of Americans are opposed to the continued U.S. nuclear testing.

The U.S. Administration's reluctance to reckon with this fact confirms that it is promoting only the interests of the military-industrial complex and of the ultra-right-wing forces which are concerned solely with boosting their profits derived from the arms race and which entertain the futile hope that the United States might, one day, achieve military superiority.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1403

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SENATOR URGES U.S. TEST BAN AT NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

LD261529 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT 26 May 86

[Text] Luxembourg, May 26--TASS correspondent Albert Balebanov reports:

Luxembourg's Prime Minister Jacques Senter today urged the parliamentarians of the 16-member countries of the North Atlantic Assembly to promote an earlier achievements of agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union on disarmament matters, the widening and deepening of a dialogue and contacts.

On his part, president of the North Atlantic Assembly Senator Charles Mathias of the United States urged the parliamentarians to press that the United States follow the Soviet Union's example and stop its nuclear testing, that Washington continue adhering to the existing agreements with the USSR on limitation and should not jeopardize by its star wars programme the prospects for talks on disarmament that are of exceptional importance for mankind's future. The main theme of the debates at the spring session of the North Atlantic Assembly that ended today were the U.S.-West European differences which touched upon such important aspects of transatlantic and international relations as commercial and economic ties, cooperation in the military sphere, east-west relations, ways and methods of combatting terrorism.

/9716

CSO: 5200/1403

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW BROADCAST: TEST BAN COULD END ARMS RACE

LD021811 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 1 Jun 86

["Top Priority" program presented by Pavel Kuznetsov with Prof Radomir Bogdanov and Prof Sergey Plekhanov]

[Excerpts] Radio Moscow presents "Top Priority" and I'm Pavel Kuznetsov, your host. Together with me in the studio are Professors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov and the issue for today is a comprehensive nuclear test ban. On 21 May, the United States detonated another nuclear device in Nevada. The Department of Energy said that the yield was slightly below 20 kilotons and that the test was weapons related. On the one hand we have 11 American blasts since the Soviet Union stopped all nuclear testing and on the other hand we have three Soviet extensions of its unilateral moratorium. Professor Bogdanov, don't you think we have a rather unique situation between the world's leading military powers?

[Bogdanov] What is unique Pavel? It seems to me it's the usual situation in the Soviet-American arms race. We are always behind the Americans, we are always catching up with the Americans. But this time what is unique really [is] that we don't catch up with them at all. [sentence as heard] (?They have just stopped testing). Now, my problem is not counting down how many tests they had. My problem is why they don't join us, that's my problem, you know? And I'm afraid that many people in the world have the same question. Our position is very simple, maybe the simplest in the world: You just stop testing and you are -- by that you're killing the nuclear devil -- step by step. That's very simple for the Americans to join us. Why? Because it doesn't interfere with anybody's security, real security. Now you have such a high-tech computers that you can on computers to check up your device, nuclear device, whether it will detonate or not. You don't need to detonate it in the dune you know.

[Kuznetsov] You're talking about a so-called reliability test?

[Bogdanov] Yes, a reliability test and (?I'm aimed at) one very interesting problem. How many explanations the American side had about why they don't join the Soviet Union. I don't [word indistinct] and they're so different that I'm at a loss [word indistinct] which one's the real one. Now I believe that they're telling the truth. You should always test new models, always new models of nuclear weapons.

That's one side of the story but I'm afraid and my suspicion is that it's more than that. It's going about "star wars," that's where the dog is lying you know. That's the "star war" problem. They say that "star wars," that this American President states that "star

"wars" has nothing to do with the nuclear weapons, they are just meant to, you know, to abolish nuclear weapons. Now, they are testing nuclear devices which are meant to activate [as heard] nuclear laser, you know that's their main problem now. Now my question is where is the nonnuclear SDI? My statement is, you know, my message is that nuclear testing, it's another way out to get a nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union and to achieve the first strike capability by one way or the other, now I'm absolutely sure.

[Kuznetsov] My question to you, Professor Plekhanov: Reputed American journalists like James Reston and Tom Wicker tell us that a comprehensive test ban was a stated goal of every American Administration since Dwight Eisenhower to Jimmy Carter and President Reagan too put a test ban on his list of foreign policy priorities and when he came to office, when he was elected. But then he dropped it from his list of priorities. Why?

[Plekhanov] Well I don't think that the idea of a test ban was anywhere high on their list of priorities. Maybe it was one of the campaign promises that they had to make in order not to sound too extremist in their approach to military matters. I'm saying this because one of the first things that was done by the Reagan administration when it came to power was to discontinue American participation in the comprehensive test ban talks, the talks that were going on between the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain for years, and the talks that brought the three powers almost to the final point of agreement. The treaty, by 1980, the treaty on comprehensive test ban was 95 or 90 percent ready. But then the United States dropped out of that endeavor.

So I think it would be more accurate to speak of their priority (?as) dropping out of the test ban talks and the reason why they do it is very simple, because they don't believe in stopping the development of new kinds of weapons. They think that this idea of modernizing what they call the deterrent, modernizing their strategic forces, is something which is necessary for American security. Now we have seen in the American foreign policy thinking, we've seen a retrogression to a prenuclear mode of approach to how you provide for your security. We've seen a trend toward relying on force, on unilateral use of force, on the ability of the United States to threaten others who may not agree with them on this or that point and in order to effectively threaten you need to have what they call a deterrent. The greater it is the more credible your threat.

[Kuznetsov] The past administration also talked about the need to modernize their weapons and still they talked, kept talking about a test ban. And they not only talked, we know that in 1973 [as heard] there was a partial test ban treaty.

[Plekhanov] That's right. You referred to the earlier attempt. Now it's important to keep in mind that when the partial test ban was concluded in 1963, a rationale behind the military establishment, the establishment's consent with the treaty, they were not happy about the treaty and there was some open dissent in the military circles in the United States but they went along on the condition that the program of underground nuclear tests would go at full speed. In fact they thought that the United States was technologically ahead of the Soviet Union and they thought that by eliminating, by banning atmospheric tests they would be able to gain an upper hand over the Soviet Union. So even in that kind of measure they were looking at it for some advantages over the Soviet Union and now when the question is about stopping all kinds of tests, stopping underground tests, this is a kind of a final point. I mean if you ban them it's curtains for a nuclear arms race. It's very difficult to race if there is no testing. So this is a last stand of the people who believe in nuclear weapons and nuclear wars and winning nuclear wars and so on.

[Kuznetsov] Professor Bogdanov, I want to combine two questions in one and put them to you. You know better than I do that our moratorium since it was announced is presented as propaganda and at the same time we know we get a lot of letters in our local press, on television and radio where people, Soviet people, are truly concerned about our moratorium in the sense that while the United States keeps testing and we don't they are in for getting ahead of us, for surging ahead of us and acquiring military superiority. Perhaps we're overdoing with our moratorium.

[Bogdanov] You know, once I said to our American listeners over there if we are accused in that kind of propaganda I accept it.

This is really a propaganda, propaganda for peace. There is nothing wrong with that, that's number one. Number two: I agree with (?you), it's becoming really embarrassing and little bit worrisome. They continue testing and we stop that and in our high technology (?year) when time passes in such a quick way, it's really, we are losing time, we don't do anything. Why? I sometimes -- I put the same question to myself and to my many friends and maybe your friends, and your friends Sergey, while discussing with us, they also put that question: How long? How long? You know I believe that our leadership is in that particular thing they're very right, you know. Let's divide the problem into two parts, one is security and the other one is moral part of the story.

Security, what is security nowadays, you know? I believe, to be frank with you, whatever it is already in the nuclear arsenal is more than enough, I emphasize, it's more than enough to destroy each other maybe 12 times, or 10 times, it makes, for me personally it makes no difference how many times...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] One time is enough I think.

[Bogdanov] One time, maybe quarter of a time is enough to destroy [word indistinct] I don't worry about numbers.

[Plekhanov] I think that one need not counterpose security and morality in this particular case because really with this overkill capability, building up more weapons does not make anyone secure. So participating in this mad race toward oblivion, and not trying to stop it by one's own example would be a big mistake, if one realizes how terrible the nuclear weapons are and how many of them there are.

[Kuznetsov] In other words you suggest that they do not realize this in Washington?

[Plekhanov] They prefer, they prefer...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] The other way?

[Plekhanov] No they prefer not to believe in that. They think that they can intimidate others if they have more than others, which is a very cynical viewpoint because they know that nuclear weapons are not usable. But you see there is a vicious circle here. If you value nuclear weapons for their intimidating capacity, and yet if you know that they are not usable then you're, the credibility of your threat diminishes because nobody will believe that they will use them. So the logic of those people is let's make the world believe that we can and will use them if we are, if we have to. When Richard Nixon was president he grappled with this dilemma and he said, came up

with something like a mad president theory. He said that our credibility increases if the adversary thinks that I am capable of mad acts. Now this is the insane logic which is behind this (?talk).

[Bogdanov] But you know I am afraid that this administration is not following the same line. They are very open in their you know, in their action. They are telling openly that we need new arms. We come across quite a number of statements in the Congress about that: We are testing because we need new modernized, more accurate arms, nuclear arms -- that's all. That's the answer. What for? Just to prevail over the Soviet Union, that's very simple.

[Kuznetsov] My question to you Professor Plekhanov, why do you think is, there is such a vicious campaign against a test ban, do you think it's because it's so appealing to the general public, or what?

[Plekhanov] Well of course, it's a simple idea, it's a correct idea, it's one of those things that's just a direct hit at a very sensitive spot in this structures of the arms race, and that's why it hurts, I mean it really hurts.

[Kuznetsov] And perhaps that's why it's called propaganda?

[Plekhanov] That's why it's called propaganda, but no matter what you call it...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] It's very well, it's easily understood by everybody.

[Plekhanov] That's right and besides, you know, it's not just talking, it's doing, or rather not doing, desisting from doing some bad things, and so the continuation of a moratorium I think is a very persuasive thing, and the administration, the Reagan administration is just feeling the pinch.

[Kuznetsov] Our time is running out and I'd like to end this edition of "Top Priority" with a question to you, Professor Bogdanov. A few days ago President Reagan again said that his administration intends to scrap the SALT II treaty by the end of the year when more B-52 strategic bombers are equipped with longrange cruise missiles. Do you see any connection between their policy on a test ban and a series of statements concerning the intention to break out of the SALT II treaty?

[Bogdanov] I believe that all that belongs to the same category of things. It's another buildup of military superiority over the Soviet Union. If you ask me what is the difference between President's statement and all his previous statements about SALT II my answer is very short. For the first time the President didn't mention that he is doing that for the sake of saving the treaty, he said that he has destroyed that just because economically it's not profitable to keep them...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] In service, yes.

[Bogdanov] In service. Then you have another threat against the Soviet Union. If you don't dance on our music we will scrap the treaty [word indistinct] so it's another act of intimidation, that's my answer.

[Kuznetsov] In other words the limits of the previous accords are too tight for them?

[Bogdanov] Oh yeah, you do not need to be a great -- you know -- expert in arms control, you just should look at what's going on in the American military establishment and what is the military, or defense policy of this administration. The answer is there. Treaties are no more valuable for (?that), they are just you know (?tidying) their accounts, that's my answer.

[Plekhanov] (?Pie crusts) to be broken.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, thank you very much, thank you very much, our time is up. This is "Top Priority," I am Pavel Kuznetsov, good-bye till next week at the same time and on the same wavelengths.

/9716

CSO: 5200/1403

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: U.S. TIMES TEST FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DAY

LD051819 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 5 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 5 TASS — TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

Another nuclear test was conducted in an underground silo at the Nevada test range today. That was this year's fifth nuclear test officially announced by the U.S. Department of Energy and the twelfth one since the Soviet Union introduced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions on August 6, 1985. The yield of the explosion was from 20 to 150 kilotons, and, as a spokesman of the Nevada test range has stated, "had a bearing on nuclear arms."

Thus, the test has provided a fresh evidence of the administration's criminal disregard for the world public demands for an end to the nuclear arms race, for the prevention of its transfer to outer space and for safeguarding mankind against a nuclear catastrophe. According to official data, the Nevada nuclear test codenamed "tajo" has brought to 651 the number of nuclear tests announced by the United States since 1951.

Administration spokesmen keep stating that after the start of the conduct of nuclear tests underground, the tests no longer pose danger from the viewpoint of a discharge of radiation into the atmosphere. However, such assertions are quite far from the truth. Even officially it was admitted that in a number of cases such a discharge did occur, poisoning the environment and impairing people's health. According to expert estimates, the aggregate leak of radiation during the conduct of underground nuclear explosions in Nevada by far exceeds the release of radiation as a result of the Chernobyl accident over which a wave of hysteria was stirred up in the United States on the plea of "care" for countries which neighbour on the Soviet Union. The mendacity of the administration's assertions as to its "concern" for the environment and human health is emphasized by the fact that the explosion "tajo" was pointedly timed for the world Environmental Protection Day which is traditionally observed by a U.N. decision on June 5.

No less mendacious are the administration's assertions that the USA's refusal to discontinue nuclear tests and thus put an end to the sophistication of nuclear arms and prevent the development of new types of weapons, including space systems, is ostensibly accounted for by the administration's desire to promote talks on reaching agreement on a reduction in nuclear arms and even on their complete elimination. It was precisely such "arguments" that were adduced on the eve of the nuclear test in Nevada in President Reagan's message to Congress. In the message, he demanded that the administration's request for appropriations for military needs for the 1987 fiscal year be fully satisfied.

The message pointed out that the United States would go ahead with implementing the U.S. "strategic modernisation program" and speed up the realisation of the "star wars" program.

In the area of the Nevada test range, police arrested another group of activists of the movement for an end to nuclear tests. The activists who keep round-the-clock vigil have set themselves as an object to attract the attention of as broad circles of U.S. population as possible to the administration's stubborn unwillingness to listen to the voice of reason and to join the Soviet moratorium with a view to elaborating a treaty on a total and final ban on nuclear tests as soon as possible.

/9716

CSO: 5200/1403

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

IZVESTIYA EDITORIAL ARTICLE ASSAILED U.S. NUCLEAR TESTING PLANS

PM031543 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "From a Position of Recklessness; How Washington Explains the Desire to Continue Nuclear Tests"]

[Text] It was 30 years ago, in June 1956, when the USSR Supreme Soviet issued a statement that noted the following: The Western powers negative attitude toward the Soviet Union's constructive proposals aimed at the liquidation of the nuclear threat to mankind "will not deter the Soviet Union in its struggle for a complete ban on atomic weapons and for the urgent termination of thermonuclear weapons tests as a first step along this path." It is due to opposition by the West, and primarily the United States, that this task even today appears on the agenda of international life. Furthermore, the need for its swiftest possible solution today is incalculably greater than 3 decades ago. This why the USSR's stance, outlined with utmost clarity in the 15 January statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, confirmed by the 27th CPSU Congress, and enshrined in the CPSU Program, is to attain "the stage-by-stage implementation of a complete liquidation of nuclear weapons by the end of the 20th century by way of terminating the tests and production of all their varieties." Proceeding from this premise, the Soviet Union actively and consistently advocates the termination of nuclear tests. The latest confirmation of this is contained in the Soviet Union's recent decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 6 August.

What is the West doing? How did the United States respond to this decision? On 21 May, the Pentagon conducted yet another nuclear explosion at the Nevada test site, the 4th officially announced test of 1986 and the 11th since the Soviet moratorium was announced, and the 650th since 1951. This, and other similar actions, need no extensive interpretations. The White House openly expresses unwillingness to join the Soviet moratorium and displays an intention to continue nuclear tests.

Today it can be confidently asserted that a belief has developed and is strengthening among the international community as a whole that the termination of nuclear tests is a practical step toward the liquidation of nuclear arms and, moreover, does not lead to the undermining of anyone's security. The people can draw closer to the cherished goal only if our example is also followed by the other nuclear powers, primarily the United States. Washington, however, refuses to accept Moscow's invitation for a joint approach toward a nuclear-free future.

What is it that encourages the White House to reject the hand extended to it? Why is it that explosions thunder time and time again in the Nevada desert, reducing the people's hopes to ashes? The U.S. Administration justifies its stance by the following selection

of deductions: Nuclear arsenals are needed by the United States as "means of deterrence against the enemy," nuclear weapons must be constantly checked in order to maintain the "reliability and effectiveness" of these "means of deterrence," and such checking is possible only by conducting nuclear explosions.

K. Adelman, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, outlined this "concept" with exhaustive bluntness. "We hope," he declared, "to reduce nuclear arms, we hope to conclude accords and develop technology that could change the prevailing situation to a greater or lesser extent. To this point, however, such changes have not occurred, and an imperative need for deterrence exists as before. In order to ensure the reliability and effectiveness of our means of deterrence it is necessary to conduct tests of the weapons that constitute these means. Tests are necessary to ensure deterrence."

Let us leave to the director's conscience the claim that he hopes to reduce nuclear arms. It does not in the least correspond with Washington's practical policy.

The United States, with its actions, destroys people's hopes that accords on curbing the nuclear race can be reached. However, this is not the only issue. Let us examine more carefully the term "deterrence" with which Adelman is juggling.

The White House has its own interpretation of this concept. The same interpretation was given in National Security Council Memorandum 68, which was ratified by H. Truman back in his days as U.S. President. This is what this document says: "Under the deterrence concept, it is seen as vitally necessary to maintain a strong military position... Without the basis of superior military strength in a state of combat readiness and able to be rapidly mobilized, the deterrence policy, which to all intents and purposes is a policy of planned and gradual coercion, will be nothing but a policy of bluff." In other words: The U.S. concept of "deterrence" is aimed at creating military superiority over the USSR, which would allow the United States to pursue a "policy of gradual and planned coercion" against our country and the entire world. Washington does not envision a "deterrence policy" without its nuclear arms. While this political course is a categorical imperative for the U.S. Administration, the White House does not want to hear about the elimination of nuclear arms that the Soviet Union is calling for and is prepared to undertake.

An analysis of the other "arguments" adduced by the U.S. side to justify its refusal to join in the Soviet moratorium only emphasizes Washington's bad faith in its approach to the most important problem of the day.

For instance, the White House puts forward the "verification (kontrol) problem" again and again. Is verification (kontrol) of the observance of accords necessary? Of course it is. Perhaps the Soviet Union needs it even more than the United States. The facts attest to repeated cases of the U. S. side exceeding the limit for its tests of nuclear charges, a limit that was laid down by the treaties on underground nuclear weapons and on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes (these treaties, signed in 1974 and 1976 respectively, have still not been ratified by the United States, thereby thwarting the measures envisaged by these documents aimed at improving the sides' confidence in the precise implementation of accords). Instances of U.S. violations of the 1963 treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and under water, when radioactive material was scattered beyond U.S. national territory as a result of underground nuclear explosions are also well known.

In light of these facts it is obvious that the Soviet Union is interested in reliable verification (kontrol) of accords, no less than the United States at any rate. But Washington is pretending that it knows absolutely nothing about this Soviet position.

No less "convincing" is the thesis put forward by G. Shultz opposing a U.S. moratorium on nuclear explosions. The U.S. secretary of state, explaining to congressmen the reasons for refusing to introduce a moratorium, stated that it would be unrealistic "while there are no agreements on fundamental reductions to nuclear arsenals." Yes, there really are no such agreements yet. But, first, the explosions intended to modernize and upgrade nuclear arsenals not only do not promote the conclusion of such agreements but put more and more obstacles in the way. Second, the(ending) of nuclear tests -- since it freezes the qualitative parameters of nuclear arms -- would only promote reaching accords on fundamental reductions to nuclear arsenals. This is precisely what the United States does not want, gambling on achieving nuclear missile omnipotence. This is borne out by the decision made in Washington essentially to abandon SALT II, a step that has been assessed in the world and in the Soviet Government statement published a few days ago as provocative.

Hiding the blatantly aggressive nature of its policy behind the term "deterrence," whose true meaning has been concealed from the broad circles of the Western public, Washington is counting on the fact that the world will also understand the thesis on holding nuclear tests as a means of "ensuring the reliability and effectiveness of the means of deterrence." But what "reliability" and effectiveness is that?

The United States pretends that only those kinds and types of armaments already in the nuclear arsenals are subject to "reliability and effectiveness" tests. But their combat readiness has already been established with a sufficient degree of reliability in tests held in the past. Specialists are convinced that nuclear test explosions are not necessary to verify the reliability of a nuclear weapon. Reliability can be established, Western experts claim, by testing the nonnuclear components of nuclear weapons.

Explosions conducted with the aim of modernizing existing nuclear armaments and creating new, more sophisticated and more destructive forms are another matter. The facts demonstrate that Washington's desire to retain its "right" to conduct nuclear explosions is aimed precisely at the qualitative reequipment of its nuclear arsenals, not at "verifying reliability." In this connection the U.S. press has reported that the Pentagon intends to use the more than 15 explosions planned for this year to test new nuclear warheads for MX ICBM's, B-61 tactical bombs and B-83 strategic bombs, 8-inch and 155-mm nuclear artillery shells, warheads for Midgetman missiles and submarine-based Trident-2 missiles, new nuclear depth charges, nuclear antiaircraft missiles based on SM-2 ships, SRAM-2 short-range air to surface nuclear missiles, and so on and so forth. By no means least in this program is the place occupied by space-strike armaments, that new element intended to transform the present U.S. nuclear "triad" into a "quartet." There is no doubt that ending nuclear tests is a clear obstacle to all these preparations for Armageddon. For the people of the world, including the American people, of course, that would undoubtedly be a boon. But it is not "boon for mankind that the White House is thinking about now -- rather, it is a "policy of planned and gradual coercion" based on "superior military strength." That is how Washington understands "deterrence," incapable as it is of abandoning the concept formulated by U.S. strategists approximately 35 years ago.

"But it is not the middle of the 20th century that is before us now: Rather, we are on the threshold of the 3d millennium. And to try to act "from a position of strength" is a venture as futile as it is dangerous. The present level of the military-strategic balance between the opposing sides is approaching a critical point and the continuation of the nuclear arms race, for which Washington is striving, merely thickens the clouds of the nuclear catastrophe threatening the planet.

The 27th CPSU Congress stressed that the doctrine of "deterrence" ("sderzhivaniye") or "intimidation" ("ustrasheniye") preached in the United States merely spurs on the arms race that may sooner or later get out of control. There is still time to prevent that. The moratorium on nuclear tests could be the departure point to a secure future for mankind if the United States finally recognizes the futility and dangerousness of pursuing nuclear superiority.

The Soviet Union will not hold matters up. The proposal for a meeting between the USSR and the U.S. leaders in any European state's capital or in Hiroshima to reach an understanding on the cessation of nuclear explosions and on banning nuclear tests remains in force. Just as the Soviet people's will to prevent a thermonuclear conflagration on earth remains indestructible.

/9716

CSO: 5200/1403

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

STOCKHOLM PAPER CITES SOVIET AIDES ON NORDIC NFZ

PM181331 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 16 Apr 86 p 8

[Harald Hamrin dispatch: "Soviet Union Would Not Withdraw Nuclear Arms"]

[Text] Moscow--The Soviet Union is not prepared at the present time to reach any decision on the question of the total withdrawal of all its nuclear-armed forces in the Baltic in the event of the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area. This question can only be resolved in the context of negotiations involving all "interested parties."

So declared a representative of the Soviet Foreign Ministry at a press conference for Swedish journalists in connection with Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson's visit to Moscow.

The Soviet Union has previously declared that it is prepared to discuss the possibility of giving the Baltic nuclear-free status in connection with the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area.

Asked whether this means that the Soviet Union is prepared to withdraw all its nuclear-equipped vessels from the Baltic and also agree to a ban on the passage of such vessels into and out of the Baltic, Yevgeniy Rymko, deputy chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Scandinavian Department, declared that "this must be the object of discussions with interested parties." Asked whether he here meant--in addition to the Soviet Union and the Nordic countries--the other Baltic states of Poland, and East and West Germany, Rymko said that the "concept of 'interested states' refers to a wider circle."

At the same time the Soviet Foreign Ministry's official press spokesman, Vladimir Lomeyko, made it clear that the Soviet Union's position on the zone issue, despite speculation to the contrary, has not changed. The Soviet Union is willing to give multilateral or unilateral guarantees to the states forming part of a zone. The Soviet Union is also willing to discuss measures to be taken on its own territory which would facilitate the creation of such a zone. And finally the Soviet Union is willing to discuss the status of the Baltic.

Rymko said that no negotiations on a Nordic zone have begun and that it is therefore not possible to specify the Soviet position on individual questions of detail.

On the sensitive question of the drawing of a demarcation line in the Baltic, Rymko was also unwilling to go into any detail, this time pointing out that negotiations are in progress between the Soviet Union and Sweden.

"But the delegations to the negotiations are trying to find a mutually acceptable solution," he said.

Otherwise both Rymko and Lomeyko spoke in generally positive terms about Swedish foreign and neutrality policy.

"It is our hope and conviction that Prime Minister Carlsson's visit will give new impetus to a broadening and deepening of bilateral relations and mutual confidence," Lomeyko said.

He also repeated past declarations to the effect that the Soviet Union "respects Sweden's independence and territorial integrity" and that Swedish foreign policy "is an important factor for stability in the Nordic area and the whole of Europe."

/9716
CSO: 5200/1403

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

TASS ON FRENCH MURUROA TEST--London May 31 TASS--France conducted the fourth and this year's most powerful underground nuclear explosion at Mururoa Atoll in the southern Pacific on Friday. According to reports from Wellington (New Zealand), the yield of the explosion was about twenty kilotons. The French authorities do not cease nuclear tests, exposing the ocean flora and fauna to a great risk of radioactive contamination, despite strong protests by the countries of the Pacific Ocean region and by the entire peace-loving public of the world. This was already the 79th nuclear explosion at Mururoa Atoll since June 1975. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0918 GMT 31 May 86 LD]

/9716

CSO: 5200/1403

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: EUROPEAN ASPECT OF INF, CW, SDI, NFZ, MBFR ISSUES

AU300701 Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN in Russian No 5, May 1986 (signed to press 22 Apr 86) pp 103-113

[Article by A. Vtorov and Yu. Karellov: "Dynamism of the USSR European Policy" -- uppercase passages published in boldface]

[Excerpts] By working out the strategy for building the foundations of comprehensive international security, the 27th CPSU Congress has also made a qualitatively new contribution to the concept of the USSR's European policy. Boldly and thoroughly analyzing the nature of fundamental changes in the development of the contemporary world that is by no means the same as it was 30 or 40 years ago, the congress pointed out the objective need for new thinking and innovative approaches to urgent world problems. This reinterpretation of the entire complex of contemporary international relations also fully applies to Europe.

The CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the congress notes: "The CPSU considers one of the basic sectors of its foreign policy to be the EUROPEAN ONE. Europe's historic opportunity, and its future, lies in peaceful cooperation between states of that continent. It is important, while preserving the capital that has been built up, to move forward from the initial phase of detente to a more stable, mature detente, and then to the creation of reliable security on the basis of the Helsinki process and radical cuts in nuclear and conventional weapons."

Is such progress possible? Yes, the task set by the CPSU is not an easy one. However, it is based on the careful and precise consideration and analysis of all factors of European politics, that is, political, military, economic, social, and economic factors. Some of them have been determining Europe's political fate for a long time already, whereas some others have begun to fully manifest themselves relatively recently.

FIRST FACTOR. Today the situation in Europe is influenced more than ever before by the dynamism of the economic and political development of the countries of the socialist community. The socialist part of the continent is one of the most rapidly developing regions of the world. CEMA already accounts for approximately one-third of the world's industrial production.

The Europe of socialism not only demonstrates the possibilities of the socialist way of life but, essentially, it also ensures the continent's political stability, including its territorial-political structure, and provides the main guarantee against the threat of war. The determination of the socialist countries, united within the Warsaw Pact Organization, to safeguard the achievements of socialism in the Western sector and ensure the inviolability of their borders, established within the international legal system, is immutable.

SECOND FACTOR. In the existing configuration of interimperialist contradictions, Western Europe is one of the main centers of contemporary imperialism side by side with the United States and Japan. The region's proportional share in the industrial production of developed capitalist countries graphically attests to its potential, a share that has never been less than 40 percent in recent decades; and the rates of economic growth of West European countries as a whole are at the same level as those of the United States. West European countries have virtually reached the level of the United States in the volume of foreign investments and here and there they are even beginning to press the United States out of the American domestic market by successfully promoting their goods and services with American consumers in the automobile, ferrous metallurgy, textile, and footwear industries. The West Europeans are making serious efforts to prevent the United States and Japan from outstripping them in such important areas as information science [informatika], nuclear energy, and space.

The Americans, on their part, try to the maximum extent to "drain" out of Western Europe all the scientific-technological information that is of interest to them and to coerce the West Europeans -- as is the case in the question of participation in the Strategic Defense Initiative -- into one-sided orientation toward the United States. All this is done despite the existence in Western Europe of such an alternative as broad international cooperation in the peaceful exploitation of space. Western Europe is compelled to constantly feel the political, financial, and economic pressure from the United States that tries to use its military superiority and its supremacy in NATO for this purpose. This, in the final analysis, leads to the rise of new contradictions between them.

It goes without saying that it would be unrealistic not to see how closely interwoven the economic, military-political, ideological, and, first and foremost, class interests of the ruling circles in Western Europe and the United States have become. At the same time, however, the considerations of competitive struggle with American capital, including the struggle in markets of third countries, objectively and more and more insistently place before Western Europe the question of its role in the contemporary world. When "the heat is on," the leaders of West European countries know how to act from autonomous positions and do not allow any infringements of national interests. This also applies to the questions of cooperation between the West European countries and the Soviet Union. Another thing is also important. Having experienced the horrors and devastations of two world wars virtually during the lifetime of a single generation, Western Europe undoubtedly knows better than the United States how to value peace.

THIRD FACTOR. Europe was the first to make a start in recoiling from the "cold war" and move toward developing cooperation between states with different social systems. More than 10 years ago at the Helsinki forum, which was an unprecedented event in European history, 33 European states, together with the United States and Canada, adopted a jointly elaborated long-term program of ensuring stable peace and establishing equal and mutually beneficial cooperation on the scale of the entire continent.

And, no matter how equivocal the development of the process -- called the Helsinki process -- may have been, and no matter what difficulties may have been encountered on its path, there is no doubt that its positive elements outbalance and more than outbalance all other elements. It is no accident that all participants of the all-European conference advocate (possibly with different degrees of sincerity) the continuation of the Helsinki process.

It is no accident by any means that detente has grown the deepest roots precisely in Europe. It is here where a unique experience of coexistence and cooperation between states with different social systems has been accumulated. Both positive and negative conclusions should be drawn from this experience. Detente has brought about great positive changes in the mutual relations between all European states and has forced the militarist forces to make some concessions. At the same time, the detente of the sixties and seventies did not manage to work out an effective mechanism to restrain the arms race. The detente of that time -- and this was its main shortcoming -- was, first and foremost, political and economic and not military. It unfortunately could not impede the growing military confrontation in Europe and prevent a new wave of international tension provoked by such extremely negative circumstances for all Europeans as the deployment of American nuclear missiles in some West European countries, the missiles that were moved directly to the borders of the socialist community.

This is why ridding Europe of the nuclear missile burden that is beyond its strength has become a task of paramount importance. To accomplish this task it will be necessary to renounce many existing stereotypes of thinking. It is, however, important not to lose even a single grain of positive experience and to know how to draw correct conclusions, including conclusions drawn from the mistakes that have indisputably been permitted along the difficult road of the formation of detente.

FOURTH FACTOR. Contemporary Europe is multifaceted, full of contradictions and antagonistic tendencies. Its social development has been affected in full, if not also in greater measure, by the experience of all consequences of the great social changes of the 20th century, that is, the political changes and the changes connected with the scientific-technological revolution. At the same time, it is doubtful whether in any other region of the earth the new economic, political, and scientific-technological factors, both internal and external, have tied together the fate of different peoples and of the entire continent in such a tight knot as has been the case in Europe. The hard demands, that is, the foreign political demands and the demands of economic and social action capability and of spiritual form of society, which life itself now makes, are addressed in European conditions not only to each individual state but also to Europe as a whole.

And finally, the **FIFTH FACTOR**. What is involved in this connection are the level of intellectual development and the distinctive cultural-historical conditions of the formation of public opinion in West European countries, including the ruling class. It goes without saying that this phenomenon is not unequivocal but the rich school of European political life with its pragmatism and traditions of tolerance and common sense must be taken into account. This objectively enhances the susceptibility of a considerable section of public opinion in Western Europe, including also to a certain extent the opinion of representatives of the West European leading elite, to new phenomena and processes and makes it possible for this opinion in a number of cases to show a broader intellectual approach than the opinion on the other side of the ocean.

A considerable part of the Soviet proposals, outlined in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev on 15 January this year and incorporated in the international program of the 27th CPSU Congress, is directly addressed to Europe. Acting as the initiator of a sharp turn toward improving the general international situation, the Soviet Union proceeds from the assumption that Europe can fulfill a special mission, the mission of a new structure of detente.

In Europe the practical ways of implementing this idea lead through a maximum utilization of the positive capital accumulated in the course of development of the Helsinki process. It is characteristic that the principled foundations of the comprehensive system of international security proposed by the Soviet Union apply to four spheres, that is, the military, political, economic, and humanitarian spheres, something that corresponds to the main sections of the Final Act. This document also represents in the contemporary situation an unsurpassed model of new thinking and of nonstandard approaches to the most difficult political problems.

The 27th congress formulated the thesis of a principled importance concerning Europe's possibility for transition to a further and more stable stage of detente, the MATURE DETENTE that would be organically interconnected with building reliable security on the continent and with radically reducing nuclear and conventional weapons. Success in this colossal undertaking (and it is all of Europe and not only its socialist part that is interested in it) cannot be secured by relying on confrontation but on dialogue and mutual understanding. This will undoubtedly require a rejection of the existing stereotypes, including, first and foremost, those concerning the totality of the MILITARY-POLITICAL FACTORS that determine the nature of relations between East and West. It is first and foremost the question of the place of military force in the conduct of contemporary foreign policy, especially in European affairs, that requires a new interpretation. The world, and even more Europe, has become too fragile for the policy of force.

At the same time, both the American and the NATO military concepts continue to be based on the dangerous calculations of possible use of military force as a means of intimidation for the purpose of achieving political goals.

It unfortunately must be noted that the leadership of the United States and its main NATO allies is still held captive by impaired military-political concepts and continues to strive for an objectively unattainable goal of achieving for itself military-strategic superiority over the USSR and its allies.

Soviet foreign policy and military political approaches are determined by different concepts. As was stressed by the 27th congress, the orientation of Soviet military doctrine is unequivocally defensive. Proceeding from new approaches that break the customary logic of the arms race, the Soviet Union has proposed carrying out a complete liquidation of the Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe, including both ballistic and cruise missiles. The Soviet Union's goodwill manifests itself with full force in this aspect of our proposals. Our side has taken such a difficult step for us as that of not taking into account the French and British nuclear forces during the first stage of the Soviet plan of complete liquidation of nuclear weapons under the condition, completely naturally, that France and Britain refrain from qualitatively increasing their forces and the United States from transferring its missiles to other countries.

If this Soviet proposal, which was tabled at the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva some months ago already, were adopted, a change of principled importance would be introduced in the life of the European Continent, one of the key zones of world security: The terrible spiral of the arms race would be broken and a start would be made in moving away from confrontation and toward peaceful cooperation. No less important is another thing. The solution to the question of medium-range missiles, proposed by the Soviet Union, ensures the possibility of achieving a corresponding agreement in a very short time.

The Soviet proposals take into account to the maximum extent both the political and military realities of Europe and the considerations of West European leaders. Now, it would seem, one small thing is lacking, that is, concrete work to work out the text of an accord. As it is said, goodwill is needed. However, the impression is now that it is precisely goodwill that is lacking in the West.

The United States and some of its influential NATO allies have chosen a different road, the road of burdening the solution of the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe with all kinds of conditions and linkages. The earlier "zero" option of the United States has once again been dragged out, according to which France and Britain -- the latter with U.S. support -- could continue to increase and modernize their nuclear missile armaments whereas the Soviet Union must destroy its medium-range missiles not only in Europe but also in Asia. In this connection one can only be amazed at the extent to which some West European representatives have suddenly begun to worry about Asian security clearly to the detriment of their own security.

Achieving an accord on ridding Europe of medium-range missiles is by no means made any easier by the attempts to drown this problem in a wider context of conventional armaments, chemical weapons, and tactical missiles, each of which, of course, represents an important problem that has to be solved but which are tied into a single big knot with the obvious aim of solving nothing.

The question is completely justified: Have not the United States and its closest NATO allies fallen back on the Soviet-American accord reached at the highest level concerning the acceleration of preparations for an agreement on medium-range missiles? Is not their true goal to preserve by any means the American first-strike missiles in Europe?

There are enough signals on this account to put one on guard. Among them is the "warning" by General B. Rogers, commander-in-chief of the NATO Joint Armed Forces in Europe, that the removal of medium-range missiles from Europe would "put a hole" in the U.S. defense "umbrella" over Western Europe. Among them are also the voices, heard especially on the banks of the Rhine, about the "indispensable role" of American missiles as a military-strategic tie between the United States and Western Europe which is clearly preferred to a prospective reduction of nuclear confrontation on the continent.

Moreover, influential Western newspapers already frankly write that the "zero" option proposed by the Americans in 1980 was aimed at taking the heat out of the antivar and antimissile movement in Western Europe. It turns out that they did not even dream about reducing missiles to a "zero" level.

The same goal to misinform European public opinion and mislead the leadership of "wavering" allies (there were also some of these) was served by the claim that the deployment of American missiles in Western Europe was allegedly needed because of the appearance of the Soviet SS-20 missiles. The Governments of Britain, Belgium, Italy, The Netherlands, and the FRG most unceremoniously used this argument in striving to obtain their parliaments' consent to the deployment of American missiles on their national territories. It is now clear to everyone that the promise made by the American leadership at that time to ratify the Soviet-American SALT II treaty if the U.S. NATO allies agreed to accept American missiles in their countries has also turned out to be a deception.

Something else also has to be noted. The so-called "missile" decision of the NATO Council on 12 December 1979 already made the bloc's needs for medium-range nuclear weapons dependent on the "limitation of the increase of Soviet power." The decisions of the parliaments of Britain, the FRG, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands on the deployment of missiles in their territories also provided for the possibility for their revision in the event of a change in the military strategic situation as compared with the situation in December 1979. The readiness of the Soviet Union to completely liquidate all its medium-range missiles deployed in Europe (under the condition, of course, that the United States takes analogous countersteps) precisely creates a qualitatively new situation concerning the medium-range missiles in Europe. Moreover, as M.S. Gorbachev pointed out in his speech in the city of Tolyatti on 8 April this year, we propose precisely to destroy the reduced missiles and not to transfer them anywhere else.

This situation is now in many ways even more favorable from the viewpoint of the reduction of nuclear confrontation in Europe than the situation that existed at the time of the adoption of the NATO "two-track" decision in December 1979. For, if the Soviet proposals were implemented, there would immediately be several hundred fewer missiles and over 1,000 fewer corresponding charges on the European Continent.

We also add to this the Soviet side's unilateral removal from combat-ready duty all those SS-20 missiles -- including the dismantling of fixed installations for them -- that had been additionally deployed in Europe in response to the installation of American missiles there. If the American medium-range missiles were completely liquidated in Europe, there would also be no need to have the Soviet operational-tactical missiles in the regions where they had been deployed in their time in response to the appearance of American medium-range missiles in Europe.

These are the real facts and they are naturally well known both to the U.S. leadership and to the governments of those West European countries where American missiles continue to be deployed. However, they are in no hurry to take any reciprocal steps.

Moreover, in response to all the goodwill displayed by the Soviet Union, the installation of Pershing and cruise missiles continues and not one gesture has been made, even if only a symbolic one, that would indicate any desire to reach an agreement. It would be difficult to assess this line as anything else but short-sighted, confined by purely class and selfish considerations, and contrary to the interests of the peoples of Europe. This policy has no future.

Those who decline the solutions concerning some types of armaments by referring to other types of armaments have to be reminded that a complete liquidation of chemical weapons, one of the most dangerous and barbaric means of mass destruction, by the end of the century represents a component part of the Soviet disarmament plan put forward in the statement of 15 January this year. Europe has to play its role in this respect. The Soviet Union proposes to NATO countries — without any procrastinations or invented "difficulties" — reaching an accord on completely ridding the European Continent of chemical weapons. As one of the first steps in this connection, it supports the GDR's and CSSR's proposal to immediately set up a zone in central Europe that would be free of these weapons and the proposal of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Socialist Republic of Romania to establish a similar zone in the Balkans.

In his speech at the 11th SED Congress in Berlin on 18 April 1986 M.S. Gorbachev made major new proposals concerning conventional weapons. The USSR proposes reaching an agreement on a considerable reduction of all components of ground forces and tactical air forces of European states as well as of those of the United States and Canada that are deployed in Europe. The whole of Europe, stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals, should logically represent the geographical zone of the reduction. Being oriented to fundamentally improving the situation on the European Continent, these initiatives deprive the champions of intensified confrontation in Europe of their favorite argument that the removal of nuclear missile weapons would allegedly leave Western Europe almost defenseless in the face of the USSR's military superiority in conventional weapons. As is the case in many other respects, this established stereotype of NATO propaganda is very far removed from the real state of affairs. It is based on deliberately discounting one's own potential in conventional weapons which has considerably increased in the recent period. Simultaneously with the commissioning for line duty of new more precise and powerful models of military equipment such as tanks, other armored vehicles, artillery, and Air Force equipment, the number of other precision destructive types of weapons such as guided missiles and bombs, "vacuum bombs," means for distance-laid mining, and so forth has also increased.

The NATO operational-strategic concept is also evolving toward an even greater aggressiveness. The "Rogers Plan," adopted by NATO, is aimed at moving from the concept of "defense at forward positions" to the doctrine of preventive strikes against the forces of the Warsaw Pact countries in the entire depth of their operational-strategic formation. On the whole, the so-called conventional weapons of West European countries serve as an essential supplement to the NATO nuclear potential and represent a serious destabilizing factor.

The detailed draft treaty on initial reduction by the Soviet Union and the United States of ground forces and arms with subsequent nonincrease in the levels of armed forces and arms by the sides and the related measures in central Europe that was submitted at the Vienna talks as early as February of this year represented weighty confirmation of the readiness of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for concrete measures in the cause of the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces. The initiative of the Warsaw Pact states takes into account those elements of the position of Western participants that seem acceptable.

It has to be especially emphasized that the Soviet side proposes reinforcing all practical arms limitation and disarmament measures with reliable verification [kontrol] and inspection [proverka]. As has already been stated more than once, and stated in this connection also at the highest level, the Soviet Union is no less interested in this than other countries.

The implementation of the recent new initiative of the socialist countries for the formation of nuclear-free zones in Northern Europe and the Balkans as well as for the formation of a corridor free of battlefield nuclear weapons in central Europe would represent an important step on the path of ensuring security for the peoples of the European Continent. If other European states and the United States and Canada positively respond to this initiative and agree to begin the corresponding concrete work, this would undoubtedly represent a serious contribution to ridding Europe of the nuclear threat.

The question of the effect on European security of the U.S. plans for the creation [sozdaniye] of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" or its other variety, "the European Defense Initiative," nurtured by certain West European circles, deserves separate attention. Considered from a purely military viewpoint, the illusory nature of the attempts to ensure any, in the least effective defense against ballistic missiles by means of an antimissile "shield" is now becoming increasingly obvious. According to the admissions by prominent military specialists and major scientists, such a "defense" is all the more unattainable in relation to the European Continent because of the extreme variety of the types of delivery vehicles for nuclear weapons concentrated in Europe.

As is known, these vehicles include not only hundreds of medium-range missiles but also a large number of delivery vehicles for tactical nuclear weapons, delivery vehicles for battlefield nuclear weapons, aviation, that is, the vehicles that in general cannot be the object of interception by space-based ABM echelons. There obviously are grounds for the doubts of those Europeans who believe that the real intention of American strategists is -- as it has surfaced already more than once -- to try under the conditions of a crisis situation to cover the United States with a "shield" against a strike and assign to Europe the role of the main theater of military operations.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it believes that achieving a serious lowering of the level of confrontation in Europe is a completely realistic task. This would undoubtedly reduce in many respects the general world tension and would represent a contribution of Europeans to accomplishing the general task of beginning to curtail the arms race and strengthening peace and trust between peoples.

It is an instrument that has already been created with the joint efforts of Europeans, the Helsinki Final Act, that once again comes to the fore in considering the other major aspect, that is, the POLITICAL aspect of creating a reliable security system in Europe. The core of the Final Act is the 10 well-known principles, the entire meaning of which consists of commitments for the benefit of peace, detente, and building interstate relations on the solid foundation of peaceful coexistence.

The Soviet Union constantly demonstrates its attitude in favor of serious constructive work in all aspects of the Helsinki process and of achieving concrete results in all talks conducted within its framework, be it the forthcoming all-European forum in Vienna, the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures, Security and Cooperation in Europe, or the Bern conference of experts of CSCE participant-states on the questions of contacts between people, institutions, and organizations.

The Soviet side will spare no efforts to ensure that these meetings are not set off against one another but are used as common links in the development of detente. The statement of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee on 15 January 1986 formulated a whole series of measures designed to seriously advance the work of the Stockholm conference and facilitate its agreement on the accords that would erect a barrier against the use of force or covert preparations for war on land, at sea, or in the air.

As is known, the USSR has expressed its readiness to eliminate the main difficulty from the work of the conference and agree now on notifications about major exercises by ground and Air Forces whereas the question of naval activities would be transferred to the next stage. This creates a real possibility to speed up the work of the Stockholm conference with a view to concluding its first stage with the adoption of a concluding document. Such a document, incorporating the concrete application and maximum effectiveness of the principle of nonuse of force side by side with a definite set of confidence measures in the military sphere, could be submitted to the Vienna meeting of CSCE participant-states. However, for the time being the NATO countries are not showing an equally responsible approach to the need for organizing constructive work in Stockholm. Their striving to evade the beginning of concrete work in drafting a concluding document is hardly in accord with the demands of times.

Striving to add to the significance of the next meeting of representatives of the CSCE participant-states which will begin its work in Vienna this fall, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries proposed at the March session of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee to open that meeting at the level of ministers of foreign affairs.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1402

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET ACADEMICIAN INTERVIEWED ON CLIMATIC EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR WAR

Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Mar 86 p 3

[Interview with academician Kirill Yakovlevich Kondratyev, USSR State Prize winner by Zh. Manilova: "The Earth's Climate and the Nuclear Threat"; time and place not specified]

[Text] Recently overseas, especially in the U. S., publications have appeared, whose sponsors, scientists, conclude, based on highly approximate modeling of physical and chemical processes in the atmosphere, that in the event that nuclear war is unleashed environmental conditions on earth "will be rather completely restored in 25 years." In this regard, an article by the "father" of the American hydrogen bomb, E. Teller, a scholar of extremely reactionary views, entitled "Terrible Myths About Nuclear Weapons," is extremely remarkable. Some American specialists have even taken upon themselves the right to assert that the rapid destruction of hundreds of millions of people during a nuclear war does not mean the end of civilization. It will be possible, they say, to sit in shelters on the edges of the continents and, finally, in the Southern Hemisphere, far from the fields of major nuclear battles.

Of course, neither Soviet scholars, nor those foreign specialists who honestly and objectively assess the possible consequences of nuclear war, can agree with such irresponsible conclusions. In their research they rely not only on data from numerical modeling, but also, most importantly, on data from direct observations. A group of Leningrad scholars has, for example, the results of observations of various phenomena in the atmosphere in 1958-1962 and data on weather and climate changes in the Northern Hemisphere during that period, the period of most intensive nuclear weapons tests. What conclusions did the scholars reach? Our discussion with the leader of these efforts, Academician K. Ya. Kondratyev, USSR State Prize winner, began with this question.

[Answer] Most uncomfortable ones. The consequences in the case of nuclear war will be expressed not only in monstrous destruction and deadly radioactivity, but also in a global ecological catastrophe, which will lead to the impossibility of life on earth.

The fact is that past wars left their marks only on that part of the land where they were waged, and virtually did not touch the atmosphere and the world's oceans. The consequences of nuclear weapons will affect all of the environment. Changes in the chemical composition of the upper layers of the atmosphere, with which is associated the tremendous danger of "Star Wars" plans, will be especially important.

As is known, the atmosphere surrounding our planet was formed during a process of long geological evolution. Its present chemical composition is, to a large extent, the result of interaction with the biosphere. And, although the atmosphere consists primarily of nitrogen and oxygen, it also has optically active components, in very small quantities, including water vapor, carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, hydrocarbons, etc. It is precisely their presence which determines the very high sensitivity of the atmosphere to outside influences, for example, to the pollution of its carbon dioxide by industrial wastes.

[Question] Some time ago much was also written about the fatal impact on the ozone layer of the atmosphere from exhaust products of supersonic aircraft...

[Answer] A critically important role for life on earth is played by the presence of ozone in the atmosphere at altitudes of 10-50 km, which protects everything living on the planet from the fatal influence of the harsh ultraviolet radiation of the sun (ozone completely absorbs it). It is true that quite recently the opinion existed that the exhaust products of supersonic aircraft were doing irreparable harm to the ozone shield. But, then it became clear that these assessments were erroneous and greatly exaggerated. Research on the influence of exhaust products, and in particular of nitrous oxide, on the ozone layer played, however, an important role in the sense that they created the basis for assessing the possible influence of atmospheric nuclear explosions on the ozone. Calculations show that if the aggregate yield is approximately 10,000 megatons (according to expert data this is approximately half of the nuclear weapons now stockpiled in the world), the high temperature will lead to the breaking up of nitrogen molecules into atoms and the formation of a large quantity of its oxides.

Assessments which have been made indicate that a nuclear war of such a scale (which is more likely an underestimation than an overestimation) threatens virtually the total destruction of the ozone layer in the Northern Hemisphere and reduction of the overall amount of ozone in the Southern Hemisphere by more than 50 percent.

There is no need to explain the ecological catastrophe of such an effect on the biosphere, all the more so in that the destruction of the ozone shield will be accompanied by radioactive contamination, which will rapidly become global in scale. The formation of regions extending thousands of kilometers with especially high radioactivity is possible. In particular, the entire European Continent could become such a "hot spot."

[Question] Kirill Yakovlevich, I know that in recent years you have been deeply involved in such aspects of the consequences of nuclear war as climate.

Your reports at international symposia and articles in journals... I know, also, that your conclusions are derived not only from numerical modeling data, but also from direct investigations of the atmosphere. What are these conclusions?

[Answer] Apparently you are familiar with the term "nuclear winter?" This idea originated in 1982, when professors (P. Kruttsen) from the FRG and (D. Birs) from the U. S. published an article which disclosed one more aspect of the impact of massive nuclear explosions -- the throwing into the atmosphere of tremendous quantities of sooty aerosol and other compounds. Due to incinerating thermal radiation, nuclear explosions will cause gigantic fires in cities, forests and oil and gas fields, which will blaze for months. Therefore, a tremendous amount of aerosol will get into the atmosphere, which will reduce the entry of solar radiation. For example, at noon in the summer it will be reduced 150-fold, and a large part of the Northern Hemisphere will be plunged into darkness for an extended period of time.

The catastrophic decline of illumination will make impossible the natural growth of agricultural crops over extensive territories, and fires will destroy tremendous areas of cropland and forest ranges. Poor illumination will also have fatal consequences on aquatic vegetation. Phytoplankton and zooplankton, the basic food of the animal world in the seas and oceans, will perish.

Thus, the concept of "nuclear winter," which Soviet scholars are also studying, stems from the fact of intensive pollution of the atmosphere with sooty aerosol. The latter will not only reduce the illumination of the planet, but will also lead to substantial cooling, by several tens of degrees according to some calculations.

What can I say, the prospects are themselves terrible. However, recent research by Soviet and foreign scholars makes it possible to introduce still more burdensome refinements to the concept of "nuclear winter." The fact is, that following nuclear explosions in the areas of their greatest concentration an intensification of the "hothouse effect" may take place, as the result of pollution of the atmosphere with carbon dioxide. A situation will arise similar to that on Venus.

[Question] Truly. There almost no solar radiation reaches the planet, and the temperature on its surface is high due to the "hothouse effect."

[Answer] Yes, but on earth in the case of a nuclear war, the "hothouse effect" will not turn out to be long-lived, due to complex atmospheric processes. Very soon, specialists say, cooling of the earth's surface and the lower layers of the atmosphere will begin. Sharp climatic fluctuations may be repeated even further. The cause of such catastrophic instability of the climate, or, as is already being written in the specialized literature, climatic chaos, will be complex gaseous changes in the atmosphere, most of all, a great increase in the concentration of nitrogen dioxide and the destruction of the ozone shield. The conclusions of our atmospheric research after the nuclear tests of the late 1950's and early 1960's indicate this in particular.

In short, contemporary scientific data indicate indisputably that nuclear conflict will lead mankind to an ecological catastrophe. This final act in the life of mankind may begin with the devastation of the Northern Hemisphere, and conclude with a global climatic collapse. This conclusion was based not only on data from numerical modeling, but, I emphasize again, from analysis of direct observations. It fundamentally contradicts the opinion of those scientists in the West who believe that the influence of nuclear war is limited to the troposphere and lower stratosphere. This point of view justifies the assertion by advocates of "star wars" in the U. S. that nuclear explosions at great altitudes are not especially dangerous. But it is precisely there that nuclear explosions most change the gaseous composition of the earth's atmosphere, which is very dangerous from an ecological standpoint. Therefore, a particularly scientific approach to the analysis of the consequences of nuclear war indicates completely unambiguously the need to halt the arms race and ban and completely destroy nuclear weapons.

90b9

C50: 5200/1346

RELATED ISSUES

CANADA: PEACE ACTIVISTS LOBBY CLARK AT NATO CONFERENCE

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 29 May 86 p A4

[Text] HALIFAX (CP) — Peace activists are using this week's NATO meeting here as a chance to air their concerns face-to-face with the people who shape alliance policy.

A 10-member delegation from the Atlantic Peace Coalition met Wednesday in a heavily-guarded downtown hotel with External Affairs Minister Joe Clark, who had just arrived for the NATO conference.

The coalition represents thousands of Canadians from 44 social policy groups based in eastern Canada, including the P.E.I. Island Peace Council and Lawyers for Social Responsibility.

The coalition had only about 30 minutes to cover a variety of issues at the closed-door meeting — the use of Halifax harbor by vessels and submarines with nuclear capability and possibly bearing nuclear weapons, and NATO flight testing over Labrador.

Afterward, coalition spokesman Muriel Duckworth was blunt about what they achieved. "I think we got responses that were quite predictable. I can't put my finger on anything that was particularly encouraging to us."

But the coalition may have scored a point on the question of nuclear subs in Halifax harbor. "I think in the end (Clark) saw that this was an unsafe place for them to come and he said he would look into that question," Duckworth said.

Clark, in a visible hurry to attend another function, admitted to reporters that he and the delegation differed on a number of points, but said the meeting was a valuable one.

Duckworth said they reminded Clark that coalition members are his constitu-

ents. "We are your support group," they told him. "And if your objective in the world is to make peace in the world through our external affairs, we should be supporting you and you should be supporting us."

They also told the minister Canada should not always echo the American position in NATO.

"We wish that he would recognize that disunity on some very basic questions is valid," Duckworth said, adding that Clark seems to believe Canada cannot hope to influence the U.S. if it publicly opposes its policies.

Marian Kerans, another delegation member, said she's "rather pessimistic about the government's positions but I really do hope that we have had some influence."

Kerans said she thinks the group impressed upon Clark that many Canadians are worried about the country's role in NATO, "and I think that startled him."

The peace coalition believes Canada's role in NATO should be thrown open to debate, because the alliance's original goal of peacemaking has given way to promoting military strength.

Halifax, a city where deep military roots and loyalist traditions tend to keep a lid on public demonstrations of any kind, may be in for a change this week.

In an ambitious try for a mass protest, the coalition hopes to martial more than 1,000 people tonight for a rally on the grassed South Commons park in the middle of the city. They plan to march, holding candles, to the convention centre where the NATO talks are being held, and then on to the park where activists are staging a two-day peace vigil.

/9274

CSO: 5220/41

RELATED ISSUES

CANADA: POLL SHOWS MAJORITY REJECTS MILITARY NEUTRALITY

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 26 May 86 p A3

[Text]

More than half of Canadians are against a proposal to withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and cancel joint defence agreements with the United States, the Gallup Poll reported today.

In a survey of more than 1,000 Canadians conducted in April, the national public opinion institute found only 26 per cent favored a policy of neutrality, while 56 per cent disagreed. A decade ago when the question was asked, 57 per cent disagreed.

The survey also found that Canadians of English origin disagreed more with the proposal (64 per cent) than French Canadians (44 per cent) or those of ethnic origin (53 per cent).

The question Gallup asked was: *Some commentators have suggested that Canada withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), cancel its joint defence agreement with the United States, and adopt a policy of neutrality. Would you agree or disagree with this proposal?*

NATIONAL	AGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION
Mother Tongue Today:	26%	56%	18%
English	23	64	13
French	30	44	26
Other	27	53	20
Age Today:			
18 to 29 years	33	49	18
30 to 49 years	23	61	16
50 years and over	22	59	19

(A sample of this size is accurate within a four-percentage-point margin, 19 in 20 times)

/9274

CSO: 5220/41

RELATED ISSUES

CANADA: LABRADOR NATIVES AGAINST GOOSE BAY EXPANSION

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 29 May 86 p A8

[Article by Val Sears]

[Text]

HALIFAX — While the NATO powers plot here to hold the Soviet Union at bay, Anne Mark, 9, and her brother Steve, 10, will be on the street pleading for the alliance to get off their backs.

The Marks, with their parents, Helen and Matthew, are Inuit whose primitive life in the wilds of Labrador is being destroyed, they claim, by NATO fighter planes zooming over their hunting grounds.

Their march against the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is sponsored by a collection of peace groups that were to hold a candlelight vigil tonight against everything military.

It is a bit embarrassing for the Canadian delegation to the two-day meeting of foreign ministers from NATO countries, which was to open here today.

1,000 jobs

The Canadians are anxious to sell the NATO high command on expanding the fighter training base in Goose Bay.

If Canada beats out its only competition, Turkey, up to 1,000 jobs will be created in hard-pressed Labrador.

But the Inuit claim that the

low-flying planes already there roar over their trap lines and caribou herds, frightening everyone to death.

Inuk David Nuke, here to protest the base, said it is "not good for my people and it is not good for Canadians."

"Those planes are destroying my culture. It is cultural genocide."

The planned \$93 million upgrading of the base would add hundreds more flights a day.

Apinam Ispatau, a hunter in the region, told environmental researchers that "I was cleaning a marten one time when the aircraft flew over. The noise almost knocked me out. The jets went over 16 times."

But both NATO, which loves the huge forest — it looks a lot like the Soviet Union — and local businessmen are not worried about the few aboriginal people who live there.

While External Affairs Minister Joe Clark has agreed to hear the Inuit protest, it is unlikely that the rest of the NATO foreign ministers here will be aware of the Mark family.

Behind a wall of Mounties and security people, the 16 ministers will be busy with the issues of arms control, terrorism and chemical weapons.

NATO Secretary-General Lord Carrington told an opening news conference yesterday that it was clear the United States was losing patience with Soviet breaches of the SALT II arms-limitation treaty.

Washington has threatened to add more cruise missiles than the treaty allows if the Soviets continue to break the treaty terms.

"I can truthfully say the United States has been very patient on Soviet non-compliance," Lord Carrington said. "Now it is challenging the Soviet Union to do something about it."

He said that while East-West issues were vital, there would be much talk of "West-West issues as well."

Canada, for example, is anxious to use this opportunity to talk to U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz about tariffs on red cedar shingles, and to the Spanish foreign minister, Francisco Fernandez Ordonez, about Spanish fishing vessels trespassing in Canadian waters.

/9274

CSO: 5220/41

END

**END OF
FICHE
DATE FILMED**

7-10-86
